

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of John Galleher to be State director, National Emergency Council, for Virginia.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the calendar is in order.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alice L. Woolman to be postmaster at Coweta, Okla.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that this nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Emick to be postmaster at Temple City, Calif.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that this nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters in Illinois.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that all the other nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

RECESS

Mr. KING. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 25, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of May 13), 1935

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Helmer D. Carlson, Fox Lake.
Mary B. East, Highwood.
Leslie H. Ullrich, Kenilworth.
Joseph A. Masonick, Lake Bluff.
Helen L. Frank, Lake Zurich.
James A. Thomson, Ravinia.
Edna O. Trumbull, River Grove.
Gertrude M. Molitor, Round Lake.
James Fay Carr, Wauconda.
Herbert L. O'Connell, Wilmette.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for all the comforting and loving ministries of life, for the promise of each day, for the happiness of home, for friends whom we trust, whose presence is freshness and a sweet pulse of peace. We are most grateful for the revelation of Thy supreme sacrifice which woos us from our selfishness. At Thy command the mightiest powers of earth rise and fall; yet to Thee no falling tear is missed. O Holy Presence, keep aglow the lamps of devotion on the altars of our hearts. We commend unto Thee our President, our Speaker, and the Congress. Help us all to go forward to the tasks of the day in faith, hope, and the spirit of brotherly love; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 21, 1935, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7652. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the Federal Reserve Board, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5917. An act to provide for the appointment of 2 additional judges of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, 1 additional judge for the circuit court, ninth judicial circuit, and an additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. KING, Mr. McADOO, and Mr. BORAH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be held in the State of Texas during the years 1935 and 1936, and authorizing the President to invite foreign countries and nations to participate therein, and for other purposes.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, and I think under the circumstances probably I will have to object, I would like to know what the program is for tomorrow and the succeeding 2 or 3 days?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that probably the merchant-marine bill will come up tomorrow under a rule.

Mr. SNELL. And that will take 2 days or such a matter?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot state.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If we bring in a rule for the consideration of the merchant-marine bill and take it up tomorrow, we hope that we will finish it tomorrow.

Mr. SNELL. And what do you expect to follow that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think we have in mind the public-utility holding bill or the T. V. A.

Mr. SNELL. The public-utility holding bill has not been reported yet, and I think we ought to have a reasonable notice before that is taken up.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the business before the House today is the District of Columbia matters, and it will probably not take more than 2 hours. It seems to me that gentlemen who desire to make extra speeches might get in this afternoon rather than interfere with business tomorrow. We have some time on our hands this afternoon, and I do not feel that they should interfere with important business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. SNELL. In view of the statement made by the Chairman of the Rules Committee the other day, I object.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I shall have to object.

Mr. DIES. May I have 1 minute?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, my beloved friend and distinguished colleague, Hon. O. H. Cross, has formally announced that he will not be a candidate for reelection and that he intends to retire from public life. This announcement came as a surprise and keen disappointment to his many thousands of devoted and admiring friends throughout the country. At the conclusion of his present term he will have served in Congress 8 years. There is no Member of this distinguished body more highly esteemed or more universally loved than Mr. Cross. By his kind and gentle ways, his tolerant understanding of the frailties of others, his rugged and honest character, and his keen sense of humor he has endeared himself to everyone of his associates, and his retirement will not only be a distinct loss to his associates in Congress but also to his district and the Nation. Few men have reached his period in life with so many achievements to their credit as our beloved friend. Not only was he successful in private life and in his pursuit of the legal profession but he has the unique distinction of never having been defeated for any public office to which he aspired. This is a tribute to his sterling qualities.

Mr. Cross is essentially a self-made man. He began the practice of law without any money and he went through the trying experiences which confront every young lawyer who is compelled to rely upon his own resources. I shall always remember the story which he told me of his first experience as a practicing attorney. His first fee was \$5, which was paid in advance. After he had accepted the employment and his client had left, he went to the grocery store and bought several loaves of bread and a pound of butter, returned to his office, and, behind locked doors, proceeded to place himself on the outside of the bread and butter. Many young men would have given up in despair under the same circumstances, but with perseverance, honesty, and close application to work our friend climbed the ladder of success.

In recognition of his splendid mind he was elevated to the important Committee on Banking and Currency. As a member of that committee he has devoted himself diligently to the problems of finance and currency until he is now regarded as one of the outstanding authorities in this country on the subject of money and finance. Few men have ever mastered this intricate subject so thoroughly as our friend. Ever since his election to Congress he has been intensely interested in this subject. I recall that he was one of the first Members of the House to advocate the remonetization of silver. He was responsible for getting many interested in the subject and, in fact, taught me much of the little knowledge that I have on the silver question. He introduced the first bill in either branch requiring the purchase of silver and the issuance of certificates to pay for it. While he did not serve on the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee and could not, therefore, be the author of the bill, his original bill was used by all other Members and formed the background of the silver movement in the House which finally culminated in the passage of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, of which I had the honor to be the author. I know of no Member of this House who has contributed more to the understanding of this complicated subject than he. Believing that the money question was of transcendent importance and that it was the major factor in producing the depression, he never ceased to exert himself in season and out of season in an effort to impress upon the Membership of the House and Senate the necessity of solving it in the interest of the people. Many of the proposals which he advocated at a time when they were little understood and, in fact, unpopular have been written upon the statute books. Many other proposals which he has advanced in the committee and on the floor will eventually be enacted into law.

It has been my pleasure to have served with him for 5 years, and during all that time I have never known a man more devoted to the welfare of the common man than he. Unlike many men of substantial means, he has been a consistent progressive in the field of legislation. He has at all times been independent and fearless in the advocacy of measures that were designed to do the greatest good to the greatest

number. I have known of instance after instance where my friend Cross voted against his own financial interest because he thought it was right and for the best interest of the plain people.

His genial and happy disposition and his tolerant understanding of the frailties of others has made him one of the most popular Members that ever served in this body. In the cloakroom, Members like to gather around him and bask under the sunlight of his cheerful smile. While advanced in years, he has the viewpoint of youth, and the younger Members enjoy his association as well as those of his own age. The philosophers of old have said that the highest achievement which any man can reach is the mastery of self. Many men have been able to conquer kingdoms; few to conquer themselves. The highest tribute which I can pay to our beloved friend is to say that he has conquered himself. I have never known a man so temperate in all of his habits as Mr. Cross. The great philosopher Aristotle preached the doctrine of the happy medium. Cross is a disciple of that doctrine. He is not given to extremes. Believing that all extremes are probably wrong, my friend Cross can usually be found in the middle between the extremes. Coming from the ranks of the common people, he has never lost that understanding of their needs and that appreciation of their sturdy qualities which distinguishes a great man from a little one.

Some people measure success by the money that a man has accumulated and the fortunes amassed. Some there are who define success in terms of military fame or literary genius. In terms of material accomplishments, my friend Cross can certainly be classified as a successful man. But many of us believe that there are higher standards of success than this, and it is in terms of real success that we take pleasure in pronouncing Cross a successful man. It can certainly be said of him that he has achieved success because he lived well, laughed often, and loved much; that he gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children; that he looked for the best in others and always gave the best that he had; that he always appreciated life's values and never failed to express it; that he made it a rule not to prejudge others lest he condemn himself. It is because he deeply and unselfishly loves his fellow man that his fellow man loves him.

It is to be deeply regretted that such a man should retire from public service, for which he is so well adapted and qualified. During these uncertain and perilous times men like Cross are more needed than ever before. Many of us are still in the hope that his people will persuade him to continue his wonderful work in the Halls of Congress. But we can well understand the motives which actuate his retirement. He has certainly earned such retirement by his splendid services.

Congress will not be the same when he is gone. During the trying times through which we have all gone, Cross has been a guiding light to many of us, and a source of inspiration and encouragement. And as he goes back to private life to enjoy the fruits of a well-spent life, he will carry with him the richest reward which any man may receive on this earth—the consciousness of duties well done, and the esteem, the love, and gratitude of his fellow Members.

While, like many of us, he will not leave behind him a portrait or sculpture in the Rotunda of the Capitol, nevertheless the memory of his kindly ways and constructive service will be enshrined in our hearts, and upon the tablets of our memory his name will be carved as one who served well and faithfully and who loved his fellow man.

And I bespeak the sentiments of my colleagues of both parties when I wish for him that peace of mind which passes all understanding. May the evening of his life be spent in the midst of his loving family and his grateful friends, for whom he has worked so unselfishly and so successfully.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a letter of tribute and appreciation from some of the leading constituents and friends of Mr. Cross.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. How long is it?

Mr. DIES. It is not very long.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

BELTON, TEX., June 20, 1935.

Hon. O. H. CROSS,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE CROSS: We have just learned that it is not your purpose to be a candidate for reelection to Congress in 1936. We know that we will miss you and the splendid service and fine cooperation which you have always rendered so willingly for 8 long years. We realize that you have been working under a great strain and tension, brought about by the unusual chaotic condition of our economic affairs which has been honeycombed with dissatisfaction, communism, etc., on every hand, resulting in a spectacle the like of which we have never witnessed before! We know, though, that during the nerve-racking stress and strain of it all you have been true to your convictions, courageous and fearless in the discharge of your duties, and fulfilling your promises to the people who honored you with this important trust. Honesty and sincerity of purpose has actuated you in every movement.

Your illustrious record in Congress speaks for itself and there is nothing that we could say which would raise the high standard of statesmanship which you have already established for yourself in the sacred halls of Congress! Your public and private life has been clean, wholesome, and uplifting, ever pulsating with a warm and kindly interest in your friends, and ever willing to listen to those who needed your helpful guidance, advice, and assistance. Your service in Congress has been an inspiration to us and we are convinced that it will, indeed, be difficult to find a man who can take the torch which you soon will pass to your successor and hold it with the same firm and steady grip which has characterized your service at Washington!

Your efficient service, embracing as it did personal and detailed attention to every letter and inquiry of any importance with the promptness and dispatch of an efficient manager of a modern successful business, your attention to the varied and perplexing problems which we have brought to you from time to time, have all been appreciated more than we can tell you; and it is but natural that you have endeared yourself to us; and it is but a natural course of events that your name has been inscribed for all time to come upon our "tablets of love and memory."

We know that you have devoted all your time, thought, talents, and energies in advocating and encouraging the highest and noblest principles of life and aiding in the enactment of just and righteous laws that will aid in making America a better place in which to live. You have not practiced hypocrisy in your politics; you have not played the part of a demagogue; you have been a real statesman in the true sense of the word, dependable, "faithful as a bridge of stars"—true as steel. We know, too, that you have especially enjoyed the friendship and comradeship of your colleagues in Congress. You will miss these pleasant associations. And while you will miss these pleasant and refreshing contacts, we know, yet when you come back to your own Eleventh District, back to Waco, back to Belton, and the other towns in your district, you will come back to friends and loved ones who have known you much longer than your associates in the Capital City; and you will be welcomed back in your own home district by hearts that are just as loving and just as faithful as ever welcomed a statesman home. Yes; you will miss your Washington friends, but remember:

There is no friend like an old friend
Who has shared our morning days;
No greeting like his welcome,
No homage like his praise.
Fame is a scentless sunflower
With gaudy crown of gold,
But friendship is a breathing rose
With scents in every fold.

Your friends,

OWEN P. CARPENTER.

A. G. VICK.

ROY C. POTTS.

R. B. JAMES.

JESSE S. BLAIR.

A. ROY MITCHELL.

E. W. CLINE.

W. E. CLINE.

A. H. POTTS.

E. W. POTTS.

D. C. KEETCH.

C. G. PARKER.

TED WHITLOW.

V. R. MEANS.

MARY DEANE CARPENTER.

A. W. JACKSON.

NATE CARPENTER.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS—CONTRIBUTIONS OF STATES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I do this to call the attention of the House to the Russell amendment that was adopted to the security bill in the Senate. The House tried several times during the consideration of the security bill to place an amendment on the bill whereby the States could receive Federal aid for pensioners without contribution for a period of time. The Senate amendment allows the \$15 a month to be paid for 2 years in those States that are unable to meet the financial requirements. I think the House would be justified in keeping this Russell amendment in the security bill, and if the conferees refuse to accept the amendment, I think it is the duty of the House to vote down the conference report and ask the House conferees to recede from their objections to the Senate amendments.

To further call the attention of the House to the value of this amendment, I have addressed the following letter to my colleagues.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1935.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The following amendment offered by Senator RUSSELL was inserted in the social security bill in the Senate:

"Provided, That in order to assist the aged of the several States who have no State system of old-age pensions until an opportunity is afforded the several States to provide for a State plan, including financial participation by the States, and notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State for each quarter until July 1, 1937, to be used exclusively as old-age assistance, in lieu of the amount payable under the provisions of clause (1) of this subsection, an amount sufficient to afford old-age assistance to each individual within the State who at the time of such expenditure is 65 years of age or older, who is declared by such public-welfare agency of the State as may be designated by the Governor thereof, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Social Security Board, to be entitled to receive the same: *Provided further*, That no person who is an inmate of a public institution shall receive such old-age assistance, nor shall any individual receive an amount in excess of \$15 per month."

I am informed that a majority of the House conferees, Congressmen DOUGHTON, HILL, CULLEN, TREADWAY, and BACHARACH, are opposed to retaining this amendment.

The retention of the Russell amendment is the only thing that will make the social security bill function in many States, until such time as the States can qualify. I earnestly hope that you will support the Russell amendment by contacting the House conferees either personally or by mail, to induce them to retain this amendment. If this amendment is taken out in conference, I hope a sufficient number of House Members will vote against the acceptance of the conference report and demand that the Russell amendment be put back into the bill.

Sincerely yours,

SURPLUS COMMODITIES PURCHASED

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution of the Florida Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Florida Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20. It urges the Federal relief organization to purchase from Florida its proportional part of fish, same to be distributed to relief clients; this contention is just and proper, the resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida in session assembled (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas under \$6,000,000 worth of commodities have been shipped into the State during the last year, principally packing-house products from Chicago and other Midwestern areas, and distributed by officials in charge of rehabilitation of relief classes; and

Whereas the fishermen of the State of Florida had been overlooked, and have been unable to dispose of any of their products to any of the above-mentioned agencies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the senate and house concurring, respectfully and earnestly request the President of the United States to direct the Federal agencies purchasing commodities for distribution to relief clients within this State and other southeastern parts, a proportionate part of the fish production within this State.

Be it resolved, That a copy of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Florida be forwarded to the President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and a copy to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Florida.

Approved June 4, 1935.

Filed in office secretary of state June 5, 1935.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes upon the subject of the department racketeers and Treasury raiders in the city of Washington.

Mr. BLANTON. Make it 1 minute.

Mr. HOEPEL. I cannot tell about the racketeers in 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to address the House for 5 minutes?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROPOSED RENT COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a very important bill vitally affecting the people residing in the District of Columbia is scheduled to come before the House this afternoon. I hope Members will stay here and help us keep it off the statute books. I refer to the bill proposing a new rent commission.

We who were here during the war remember the old rent commission, which did not do a scintilla of good, which did not reduce the rents, but raised rents, and cost a lot of money. It took us years to get it off the statute books and to stop expense. It amounted to nothing in the world but placing an army of job seekers on salaries, and they performed no service of any value. It put the Government in the boarding-house business.

We should stop this rent commission bill which is coming up today. We are going to adjourn before very long and go home. In a short time we will be gone from here and our secretaries will be gone from here and thousands of people will be going out of Washington and going to their homes and rents will come down in Washington automatically.

And before we come back in January, if Washington landlords again attempt to hold us up, we will arrange to get quarters over in nearby Virginia or Maryland. We already know too much about rent commissions. We want to stop this bill, that puts another burden on the people here in Washington, and will accomplish nothing worth while, and all of us know that it is unconstitutional. There is no World War on now to create the necessary emergency.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL. BLOOM,

Managers on the part of the House.

KEY PITTMAN,
JOE T. ROBINSON,
WM. E. BORAH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2276) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment:

The House amendment provided that all appointments to the Union Conference shall be made by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. The House recedes.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL. BLOOM,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear what the Clerk read, but I suppose the amendment from which the House recedes is that amendment providing that appointments to the union conference shall be made by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes. We followed the usual custom of letting the President of the local union make the appointments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

THE ASSAULT UPON THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered last Saturday at Worcester, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered last Saturday at Worcester, Mass.:

Some years ago, in Independence Hall at Philadelphia, I first saw the room in which on July 4, 1776, John Hancock affixed his signature to the Declaration of Independence in letters so large that King George would be able to read it without putting on his spectacles, and in which 11 years later the representatives of 13 jealous and suspicious States argued and labored for nearly 4 months "to form a more perfect union." I was invited to sit for a moment in the chair which Washington occupied while he presided over the Constitutional Convention and to sign my name in a visitors' register placed on the table upon which he must have pounded again and again with his gavel when spirits ran high and debate became acrimonious. My attention was called to a design painted on the upper part of the chair—a half-disc of the sun, with extended rays. It was to that symbol Benjamin Franklin pointed when, after the final draft of the Constitution had been accepted, he rose and said, "I have often and often, in the course of these sessions and in the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to their issue, looked at that [sun] behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting, but now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

I feel that it is appropriate on this midsummer day, when we are gathered in conformity with an ancient custom which goes back to the time when our pagan ancestors met on each recurring solstice to rejoice in the return of the sun, to consider again the meaning of the symbol which 148 years ago was the object of Franklin's thought and solicitude. Is the sun of ordered liberty still rising in the American sky?

The American Constitution is today the oldest written constitution in the world. It has served as the model for many other constitutions since adopted. It has been copied both in Europe and in the Americas. At the time of its adoption it was unique; it was based on a new conception of the relationship existing between those who govern and those who are governed.

The framers of the older constitutions had proceeded on the theory that the ultimate power resides in the Government, and that the people have only such rights and privileges as the Government, through the Constitution, is willing to grant or forced to yield.

The men who sat in Philadelphia in 1787 had an entirely different idea. They drew their inspiration from the revolutionary doctrine enunciated in the Declaration of Independence that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Sovereignty, they held, resides in the people, governmental power originates in the people, and a government therefore can have and exercise only such powers as the people yield. Thus, while other constitutions had been grants from the government to the people, ours was a grant from the people to the Government. Consequently, the Government established by the Constitution was one of limited powers.

It should be noted also that the men who framed the Constitution sat in the Convention as representatives of their respective States, and that the Constitution which they wrote had to be adopted by the States as such before it could become effective. Those States were independent; they were in effect nations, and they had governments which, like the Federal Government that was being set up, were clothed only with such powers as the people had given.

We find therefore that after the Constitution of the United States was adopted this situation existed: First, all powers except those which the people had delegated remained in the people; second, those powers which the people had given to the States remained in the States unless and until surrendered to the Federal Government; and, third, the Federal Government had only such powers as had been surrendered to it by the States or delegated to it by the people. The Federal Government was one of definitely limited and specifically enumerated powers. It is important to remember that it was not a national government, but a Federal system of government that the founding fathers established.

In order to safeguard the liberties of the people, the framers of the Constitution set up a system of checks and balances. They distributed the powers of government among three separate departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. To Congress, and to Congress alone, they gave the power to pass laws. To the President, and to the President alone, they gave the authority to enforce laws. To the courts, and to the courts alone, they gave the responsibility to interpret and apply laws in cases in which the rights of litigants were in question.

There was a reason for this sharp demarcation between legislative, executive, and judicial functions. The framers of the Constitution knew history. They knew that at one time the king's will was law; they knew that he not only legislated, but in many instances heard and decided cases. They knew that the struggle for liberty had in the main been one to transfer the power to make laws from the king to the representatives of the people, and the power to interpret and apply laws from the king to an independent judiciary. The framers of the Constitution were determined to preserve the gains the people had won by hundreds of years of struggle, and therefore they were careful to enumerate the separate powers of the three departments of the Government.

Furthermore, recognizing that the tyranny of the many may be just as oppressive as the despotism of the few, the fathers wrote into the Constitution a bill of rights. They fixed boundaries beyond which the people themselves could not go in transgressing upon the freedom of the individual.

In his "Republic" Plato had declared that the "chief object in the construction of the state is the greatest happiness of the whole and not that of any part." While the authors of the American Constitution also recognized the importance of promoting the "general welfare", they were wiser than Plato in that they knew that the "greatest happiness of the whole" is best served when every man who is a part of the whole is secure in the possession of certain rights and liberties which a capricious temporary majority cannot take away.

The ideal society is one which recognizes that it exists for men and not men for it; which gives to every person freedom and opportunity to achieve to the full measure of his capacity, and which seeks in the development of the individual character the fulfillment of its highest purpose.

The men who built this Nation did not, like some of their decadent sons, inveigh against "rugged individualism." On the contrary, they gloried in it. They followed no cult of mediocrity, they sought no dead leveling of society. They did not waste their time dreaming of an economic order in which every man should have the same amount of income, live in the same kind of house, wear the same kind of clothes, own the same number of acres, and maintain the same bank balance as every other man. They recognized that nature, which never gives to any two trees the same foliage or even to any two blades of grass the same structure and form, does not invest any two men with the same capacity. They knew that some, by reason of greater foresight, more talents, and better self-control inevitably outstrip their fellows. When the founding fathers said that "all men are created equal", they did not refer to equality of ability or wealth or position, but to equality of right and opportunity.

So today, if we follow the fathers and heed the Constitution which they wrote, we shall seek the answer to our social questions, not in a dead leveling of society, but in the removal of artificial handicaps and the withdrawal of special privileges; we shall find the solution of our economic problem, not in tearing down our neighbor's house, but in building one of our own. There is enough sporting blood in the average American to make him willing to take his chance if he is given a fair field where there are no favors.

Our ideal of America was well expressed by James A. Garfield when he said that "while European society is stratified like the rocks in the earth, ours is stratified like the ocean, where from the sternest depths any drop may rise to glisten on the highest wave that rolls." Such a society we can have under the Constitution, without confiscation, without regimentation, and without destroying our social and economic order.

Thus far, in developing my subject, I have sought to show that the Constitution adopted by the fathers set up a Governmental system in which all powers not granted to the Government were reserved to the people; in which the States were as essential and important as the Nation; in which the powers of government were divided among three departments, none of which might encroach on either of the other two; and in which the individual had rights which no Government, State or Federal, could take away.

Is that system adequate for today, or should it be either scrapped or so modified as to alter its framework substantially?

This is not a political meeting, and I shall respect the proprieties of the occasion by not making a political speech, admitting that adherence to that pledge will somewhat cramp my style.

Personally, I am not ready to concede that there is any present economic or social problem that cannot be solved without fundamentally changing the Constitution. I say "fundamentally", for I freely admit that amendments may properly be adopted from time to time in the future, as they have been in the past, to meet situations due to changing conditions. The very fact that the Constitution prescribes the manner in which it may be amended shows that it was intended that it would be amended. But what I would especially stress is that while we may find it necessary to make occasional adjustments, we should approach with caution all proposals to abridge individual liberty or to alter the essential framework of the Federal system.

Recently there was introduced in the House of Representatives an amazing resolution. It proposed a constitutional amendment providing that "the Congress shall have power to make all laws which in its judgment shall be necessary to provide for the general welfare of the people."

I prefer to believe, as charity should prompt us to do, that the author of that resolution did not realize the full import of the language which he used: "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which in its judgment shall be necessary to provide for the general welfare of the people."

If that amendment were adopted, Congress could pass any law, howsoever it conflicted with provisions of the Constitution, that in the opinion of a majority of those temporarily sitting in the Senate and the House of Representatives would be for the general welfare.

A mere statute, enacted by representatives of the people, might supersede the fundamental law adopted by the people themselves. Accordingly an act of Congress would have greater validity than the Constitution. The net effect, of course, would be that we would have no Constitution.

Every provision of the Bill of Rights would be subject to abrogation. If Congress decided that it was for the welfare of the people to suspend the right of free speech, it could suspend that right. If Congress decided that it was for the welfare of the people to outlaw newspapers whose editorial policy was in conflict with the policy of the party in power, it could destroy the freedom of the press. If a majority of the Members of Congress held the view that has been officially accepted in one part of the world, that "religion is the opium of the masses", they could give effect to that view by prohibiting the free exercise of religion. If they believed that communism is preferable to individual ownership of property, they could confiscate any farm, any factory, and even any home in America.

Under such a provision Congress could usurp every power of the States; it could tear down State boundaries and destroy the Federal system. It could change the tenure and the manner of the election of its own Members. It could divest the courts of their jurisdiction. By the two-thirds vote required to override a veto, it could pass a law depriving the President of his right of veto. It could strip him of his power, or if it wished, make him a dictator. The adoption of the proposed amendment would make it possible for Congress to do in the United States everything that Mussolini has done in Italy, or Hitler in Germany.

If you think I have found in the language a meaning that is not there, let me read it again: "The Congress shall have power to make all laws that in its judgment shall be necessary to provide for the general welfare of the people."

A second resolution now pending in Congress calls for a constitutional amendment providing that "no court of the United States, or of any State, shall declare unconstitutional or void any law enacted by the Congress of the United States. All laws of the United States shall remain in full force and effect throughout the United States until repealed by the Congress of the United States, or until vetoed or repudiated by the action of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. The tenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed."

What is the tenth amendment which the author of this resolution would repeal? "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

If the tenth amendment were repealed the States would have no rights which the Congress would be bound to respect. The Federal Government, instead of being one of limited powers would become one of absolute power. The States if it suited the whim of a congressional majority, might be made merely geographical units, existing for the sole purpose of electing Congressmen. Such an amendment would not only repeal the last of the 10 articles of the bill of rights, but would place in Congress the power to nullify the other nine. Against the tyranny of any law the citizen could not assert any constitutional right, for no court would have jurisdiction to hear a case in which the constitutionality of any act of Congress was challenged.

It is difficult to believe that even the stress of economic necessity, serious as it is, would ever induce the people even to consider a proposal designed to destroy so completely the American form of Government.

Of late it has become a popular pastime among those who have been frustrated in their effort to reach Utopia by a legislative detour to challenge the right of the Supreme Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional. Even the President of the United States, at a press conference that has already become historic, in an unguarded moment gave utterance to some opinions which he may have occasion to regret.

The right and duty of the Supreme Court to consider the validity of the laws it is called upon to interpret and apply arise out

of the very nature of our constitutional system. We have two kinds of law, constitutional and statutory, the one springing from the people themselves, the other from their legislative representatives. The Constitution is, in effect, a power of attorney given by the principal, the American people, to the agent, the Congress of the United States. The acts of an agent, if within the terms of the power, are binding upon his principal; if not within the power, they have no validity. We have a Constitution which is the supreme law of the land, and statutes which are law only insofar as they do not conflict with the supreme law.

A and B are engaged in litigation. A asserts his right under an act of Congress; B asserts his under a provision of the Constitution, with which the statute is in conflict. The case comes to the Supreme Court for a final decision. Shall the Court decide in favor of A, who relies on a mere statute, or in favor of B, who rests his cause on the supreme law of the land? If the Court decides in favor of B it invalidates the statute and sustains the Constitution; if it decides in favor of A it sustains the statute and invalidates the Constitution. When faced with the dilemma of having to invalidate either the statute or the Constitution, what should the court do? To ask the question is to answer it.

There are those who, while chafing under judicial decisions they don't like, do not care to go so far as to deny the Supreme Court the power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, but demand that the Constitution be so amended that a two-thirds vote would be necessary for a judicial veto. Pointing to occasional 5-to-4 decisions, they decry the fact that it is possible for "one old man" to nullify the action of a majority of both the House and the Senate, and of the President as well. The argument is so plausible that it wins many supporters, but it is wholly specious.

It is important to remember that the issues upon which courts are asked to pass are not moot questions, but questions involving the rights of litigants. If the Constitution were so changed that it would require a 6-to-3 instead of a 5-to-4 decision to invalidate an act of Congress, the rights of litigants who challenge a statute would be impaired. Thus, in the hypothetical case I have cited, B, who rests his claim on the Constitution, would have to convince 6 of the 9 judges that he was right; A, who relies on the statute, would have to win only 4 to his side. In other words, A might win the case although 5 of the 9 judges thought he was wrong. Surely this would be not only a repudiation of the generally accepted principle of the majority rule, but a gross denial of justice.

There is nothing undemocratic in the procedure under which a majority of one may invalidate an act of Congress. One vote frequently decides the fate of a bill, or of an amendment thereto, in the House and the Senate; and a bill passed by both Houses is often killed by one man, the President of the United States. Those who argue that a two-thirds vote should be required to invalidate an act might with equal consistency demand that it should require a two-thirds vote in both Houses of the Congress to pass it.

Whenever it is thought desirable to amend the Constitution, let those who ask for an amendment submit their proposal in the manner provided in the Constitution to the people from whom the Constitution itself issued. Let there be no amendment by indirection, whether through the device of unconstitutional legislation or by tampering with the composition of the Supreme Court.

As the almost precipitate adoption of the twenty-first amendment showed, it is not impossible or even difficult to make any change in the fundamental law that the people want made.

Ratification might conceivably be accomplished by a majority of one, either in the legislature or in a constitutional convention, in each of 36 States. Those States might be the smallest—those which in 1932 supplied in the aggregate only one-third of the total vote. In each of those States the majority members of the legislature or convention might conceivably be elected by a bare majority, or even by a mere plurality, of the electors. Therefore, inasmuch as those voters who constituted a bare majority in one-half of the legislative districts in States casting one-third of the Nation's vote might decide the issue, it is at least theoretically possible for a little more than one-twelfth of the voters in the United States to change its Constitution.

While it is readily admitted that it is quite improbable that 40,000,000 votes would ever be so distributed that three and one-third million would bring about a change in the fundamental law of the land, the figures I have presented show that organizing the electorate toward that end is not an insuperable task.

Men who are influential in the Nation are at the present time advocating a change in the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Although such a change would not have the sweeping consequences of the proposals I have heretofore enumerated, it would, in view of the preponderance of the Nation's economic interest, hold possibilities for disturbing the balance between the State and national jurisdictions that should suggest caution. Any general shifting of responsibility in relation to intrastate commerce from the State capitals to Washington might lead to consequences that would be regretted.

The submission of the child labor amendment now pending represents the right procedure.

If authority is sought for the enactment of a Federal minimum-wage law, or for the enforcement of codes of fair competition, let each proposal be separately stated in restrictive terms, so that the people may know definitely the extent of the powers they are asked to delegate to Congress.

Then, whatever the decision, whether wise or unwise, we shall all abide by the result, recognizing that this is a country in which the will of the people as expressed in the Constitution is the supreme law of the land.

Some there are who have declared that the "horse and buggy" Constitution adopted in 1787 is outmoded and that we should exchange it for a 1935 model. Those who offer the suggestion and thereby inferentially offer themselves for the role of Constitution maker cannot claim the merit of modesty.

They are bold men who would undertake to write a new basic law to take the place of the one framed by that galaxy of statesmen that by the grace of God or by an unusual fortuity was assembled at Philadelphia 148 years ago this summer.

I am free to confess that no such group of men could be recruited from the House, I question whether it could be assembled from the Senate, and I doubt whether it could be constituted even from Felix Frankfurter's class of precocious sophomores. For one, I would not be willing to exchange the Constitution of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison for any brain child of Donald Richberg, Rexford Tugwell, and Hugh Johnson.

It is said that on the night before his departure for the Far East of his career of conquest, Alexander of Macedon had an interview with his tutor, Aristotle, and that the great Athenian said to his pupil: "You are about to embark upon a great enterprise that will take you into many lands and amongst many peoples, some already celebrated in arts and in arms, some savage and unknown. This last counsel I give you, that whithersoever your victories lead you, do not forget that you are a Greek."

America needs the advice of Aristotle today. Whatever the adventures we undertake, the goals we seek to reach, we have an inheritance to safeguard and to transmit—a system of ordered liberty in which statutes must yield to the Constitution, in which the people are governed by law and not by men, and in which human rights are deemed to be sacred and unalienable.

We who live today are trustees for the future of America. In our responsibility we must not fail.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of District business today I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which was dealt with exhaustively by Republicans last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

RULES COMMITTEE—LEAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file reports on various rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ISSUANCE OF BONDS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8270), to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of certain bonds, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Since the distinguished leader on the Republican side is objecting to all requests for time on this side, I believe it is ill-advised to pass important legislation by unanimous consent at this time. Therefore, I object.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Republicans may not be deprived of this wonderful speech I intended to make, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 20, this House was addressed by Hon. DONALD H. McLEAN, of New Jersey, my colleague, and a fellow member of the Military Affairs Committee. He spoke at length on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and now I rise to answer the statements that he made that day.

Let me take up the various statements of Mr. McLEAN, one by one:

First of all, Mr. McLEAN says that the T. V. A. had no authority to build other than the Norris Dam. The truth of the matter is that its creative act gives the T. V. A. the

broad power to construct dams, reservoirs, power houses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines, and so on. Strangely enough, though Cove Creek Dam is mentioned somewhere in the statute, Norris Dam, which Mr. McLEAN cites, is not mentioned anywhere in it by that name, yet the general power to build dams is unmistakably there. Therefore, the T. V. A. cannot be criticized for building dams.

A great hue and cry is made that Congress needs a report before the work goes ahead. Yet we all know that the T. V. A. has made an annual report. Besides, the President in May 1934 sent up a message transmitting a report on the progress of the work being done there (Doc. 365). This in addition to repeated testimony by the T. V. A. directors before the Military Affairs and Appropriations Committees.

Mr. McLEAN also says that a bond issue of \$50,000,000 was to be used as working capital. One of the things that he and the bitter opponents of the T. V. A. oppose is the spending of money for power and the furnishing of power for the public. As a matter of fact, the T. V. A. was launched with an initial appropriation of \$50,000,000. But the statute provision for a bond issue not exceeding that amount restricted its use wholly or in part for the generation or transmission of electric power, and so on. Therefore, the general activities were not covered by this bond issue. The T. V. A. has not issued any bonds. As far as the bond feature of the act is concerned, it is a case of the T. V. A. being damned if it does and damned if it does not.

Mr. McLEAN asserts that the T. V. A. organized the Electric Home and Farm Authority. This, of course, is not correct, at least from a technical viewpoint, although the E. H. F. A. was supposed to—and did—help the T. V. A., not to mention manufacturers, dealers, and users of electric appliances, and that means private utilities as well.

As a matter of fact, the Electric Home and Farm Authority has worked out to the benefit of the people of the United States. It does not operate wholly within the Tennessee Valley, but in some cases, operates in portions of Georgia and Mississippi, not within the geographical limits of the valley.

Because the Electric Home and Farm Authority has so far principally boomed the Tennessee Valley is due to the fact that the Tennessee Valley is the only part of the United States that now has the advantage of the T. V. A. Low-cost appliances and "yardstick" electric rates go hand in hand. However, the whole problem of rural electrification will be carried out soon and, as we know, that general subject will be dealt with in a national way. Even if the Electric Home and Farm Authority were a subsidiary of the T. V. A.—which it is not—what of it? I see nothing wrong in it, and if there happens to be another corporation which is doing something for the benefit of the people, so much the better. The T. V. A. is cooperating with the Rural Electrification Authority, of course, and with the power companies, as I presume will be done in the other parts of the United States in connection with rural electrification. On the whole, rural electrification and appliances for farms and homes are so important that no technicality should keep us from having the benefits of this happy combination.

Complaint is made that the C. C. C. men are used in soil-erosion work in the Tennessee Valley. What of it? The C. C. C. men are supposed to be used where they can benefit their country, and if they can benefit their country in Tennessee, or Mississippi, or any other State, can they not be used there the same as they are used in New York, or in the State of New Jersey? There is no reason why they should not be used where they are necessary.

Also, enemies of T. V. A. say it has given no plan to Congress. When I first came to Congress, they were talking about the Tennessee Valley and were holding hearings before the Military Affairs Committee. Day after day, week after week, and month after month we have been hearing plans

of the Tennessee Valley Authority until I, for one, am convinced that the T. V. A. is the busiest new-deal agency by a "dam site." I do not know how they could give any more plans than they have. I have before me numerous pamphlets and information releases; also, a particular report with illustrations furnished the Military Affairs Committee, and, I believe, to the Appropriations Committee, and I can hardly see how they can make any fuller or more explicit reports.

Then Mr. McLEAN states that, inasmuch as he has not gotten all the information he needs, he must go to other places to get his facts. So he goes ahead and reads *Fortune* Magazine and various other magazines to find out what the Tennessee Valley Authority is going to do, when there is no indication that they are doing all the things they are written up as doing. For example, he lists several dams to cost something like \$85,000,000, which he lists as immediate expenditures of the T. V. A., although such dams are still only on paper in future planning for the valley. It is true that the T. V. A. has considered a Hiwassee Dam, a French Broad Dam, and an Aurora Dam, and these dams may someday be built, but they are certainly not in the current T. V. A. expenditures.

Then, in this same speech, the T. V. A. is charged with ignoring the matter of national defense, not to mention the Engineer Corps of the Army. Let us talk about this thing in a sensible way. It is true that the T. V. A. started out as a national-defense proposition, because of the "white elephant" nitrate plants wished off on it. Then, if we were to conjure with words, we might say that its big contribution to national defense is to defend the soil of our country; I mean in such things as soil erosion, to prevent dust storms, and to keep our rivers from running away with the soil. It is national defense to improve navigation; it is national defense to keep our rivers from overflowing; and it is national defense to have good rivers properly harnessed, high-power transmission lines in network array for emergency service, nitrate plants ready to make munitions, and manganese and other natural resources ready to be drafted for war purposes. But, brushing aside the technicalities, the truth of the matter is that the Tennessee Valley project is not only one where we spend it on national defense—that is to say, to go to war with or to fight with—but it is one that has peace-time contributions to the public welfare.

The T. V. A. has gone far beyond its original purposes, I must admit, and I hope that it will go still further beyond, and that we will give it the legislative power to do so. If we can save farms from being washed away, why not do it? If the saving of farms is not included in the national defense, should we not save them for our economic defense? My idea is that we should go ahead and do everything we can for the benefit of our country, no matter whether the doing be classed as national defense or regional renovizing.

Mr. McLEAN praises the Army engineers and then he complains that the Wheeler Dam is being built without authority. I cannot understand how these engineers could start to build there a navigation lock, now completed, if Wheeler Dam is in violation of the law. The War Department will operate all locks along the T. V. A. navigation dams, just as it does now at Muscle Shoals, because it retains jurisdiction over all navigable streams. Incidentally, the Corps of Engineers is designing the Pickwick Landing Dam, and the T. V. A. had the cooperation of the Reclamation Bureau in designing the Norris Dam.

Much fuss has been made over the fancied lack of cooperation by T. V. A. with other Government agencies. If this were so, the Authority could not work out its many problems in the manner it is now doing. Most of its activities find precedence in the old-line Federal departments. For example, its forestation, soil-erosion, and flood-control programs are long-familiar pursuits of the Interior and Agriculture Departments. Moreover, methods being developed in the Tennessee Basin tend to produce a large-scale proved pattern which can be applied to the national picture as a whole. I do not have to remind my colleagues that recurring

floods and dust storms are the bitter lessons of national neglect. In this phase alone the T. V. A. should not be too bitter a pill for doctor-hating interests to swallow.

Mr. McLEAN seems to resent deeply that the T. V. A. has not sold any fertilizer. He did not explain, however, that the experimental plant at Muscle Shoals has, under T. V. A. operation, turned out thousands of tons of a much-needed phosphate fertilizer. Nor did he say further that, through the cooperation of State and local agriculture agents, this fertilizer is being shipped to more than 500 farms, from Virginia to Mississippi, for practical demonstration.

To be perfectly frank, the Tennessee Valley Authority does not know exactly what their fertilizer policy will be in the future. What is wrong with that? They are utilizing every resource they can of the rivers and of the lands there, and if there does not happen to be a war where they can use nitrate there is no reason why they should not thoughtfully and carefully work out a policy in the matter of fertilizer. But fertilizer is a strong subject; let us not get too deep in that.

Mr. McLEAN cites the T. V. A. made town of Norris as costing \$3,500,000 and gets "statisticritical"—there is a coined word for you—making comparisons with that and other places over the United States where dams have been built and where it has been necessary to have construction camps. In this he has given you the correct amount. He, however, wholly neglects to break down this cost to include a construction camp, two public parks, a forest preserve, a demonstration farm—and the famous cows which I may bring up later in the argument—a school, roads, and lands needed for erosion control—some 2,800 acres all told. I have not all the facts before me, but in addition to this I happen to know that the difference over the original T. V. A. estimates was due to costs of materials and labor being increased by the late lamented N. R. A.—recently slain, mostly by our dear friends, the Republicans.

He mentions likewise that Norris Dam completed would only need 20 or 30 men to operate, but wholly evades the point that Norristown is intended to be a permanent settlement where there will be certain small manufacturers, or big ones for all I know, the development of home industries and home crafts, and so on, to carry it on. There is no reason why a village of that size should not be maintained in almost any fertile and cheap-power center of the United States.

Further, Mr. McLEAN implies that the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives is a poor investment—that Uncle Sam has received poor returns on the \$300,000 loaned this locally incorporated group by the F. E. R. A. Well, maybe, in a material way this is true, yet if bringing self-help to some counties where as much as 70 percent of the people were on relief is a poor dividend, I will have to try to tune in again for better tips by that post-depression financial sage of the radio, the "Old Counselor" of Halsey, Stuart & Co. Personally, I think providing people facilities to can what they would ordinarily waste in season and buy back in cans out of season is not an illogical—or an uncanny—phase of the valley's effort to get the people to help themselves.

Last but not least, much ado has been made over the so-called "report" by Comptroller General McCarl on alleged irregularities in T. V. A. accounts and what not. To begin with, this is not a report but is a preliminary bill of exceptions filed by the Comptroller General with the T. V. A. with the understanding that they will get together and try to iron out their differences. The newspapers played the story up big, but the biggest story as I see it, is how certain enemies of the T. V. A. in Congress got hold of it in the first place. However, I do know how this group got it out. No copy of the letter was sent to Congress. It is only by hearsay that I know that the letter covered 400 single-spaced typewritten pages of accounting details. When I further hear that two full pages are devoted to the disappearance and recovery of two typewriters from the Washington T. V. A. office, I do not want to make further inquiry because by so doing I may embarrass some of my colleagues on the Hill who have also misplaced a typewriter or two of late.

The whole incident boils down to the case of an exceptional McCarl believing that the T. V. A. should not be excepted from bureaucratic redtape. Maybe the T. V. A. should be just another Federal bureau, but if we believe the T. V. A., its construction jobs—in which it believes it is setting a criterion in economy and dispatch—would have been seriously crippled by the delays of routine thumbing at McCarl's office. Besides, the details really involve engineering judgment as well as accounting practices. And the stew made over non-low-bid awards! Yet, after all the records are examined, it is found that 95 percent went to the low bidders anyway, and the remainder involved safety and responsibility factors in which the T. V. A. refused to take a chance.

But the point I want to drive home is that the T. V. A. is not supposed to be under the Comptroller General's rule of thumb. It was purposely set up otherwise. This policy was emphasized by the President in his message to Congress proposing the establishment of the T. V. A., and the conference committee of the House again stressed this provision in reporting the bill for its final passage. As the President so ably briefed it, the T. V. A. is "a corporation clothed with limited powers of government, but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of private enterprise."

And that, gentlemen, is one reason why it has been able to set the pace it has.

Even the press is beginning to realize that the McCarl report is not what the T. V. A. enemies tried to puff it up to be. In this connection, I ask permission to introduce three editorials on the subject, one from the Baltimore Evening Sun, which originally assailed T. V. A. on the basis of McCarl's exceptions; another from the Engineering News-Record, a McGraw-Hill publication which speaks for the profession; and the third from the Knoxville News-Sentinel, of the Scripps-Howard group:

[From the Evening Sun, Baltimore, Wednesday, May 22, 1935]

AN ANSWER COMES

Last week Senator AUSTIN offered 26 pages of itemized charges against the management of the T. V. A., claiming these to be excerpts from a much larger report on the management of the T. V. A., which had been made by Comptroller General McCarl. There is not space to go into the charges in detail. Sufficient to say that in general they charged dishonesty and inefficiency in the handling of funds and gross mismanagement. In suggesting at the time that the charges should be met and answered, we did no more than to reflect the opinions of most honest people.

Well, the charges have not been answered in detail. Nevertheless, at the T. V. A. hearing yesterday they received an answer which will be sufficient for most people. We quote from the account of the hearing:

"Mr. McCarl, for whom a hurry call was sent out . . . proceeded to disown not only the Cassidy digest (the one offered by Senator AUSTIN) but also the audit report on which it was based.

"I don't want to discuss the audit report," he told the committee, "because to me it isn't official and it is not before you."

"Chairman McSWAIN told the committee yesterday that Mr. McCarl looked upon the audit report as only 'a bill of exceptions' and believed the T. V. A. directors would be able to explain satisfactorily all the exceptions it raised. . . . Mr. McCarl concurred in this view."

Asked whether he had found any evidence of fraud, Mr. McCarl replied:

"I want to say 'no.' This is a serious thing. You're dealing with a public trust. This is all premature. . . . I certainly have found no fraud."

This is a blanket denial that he had uncovered fraud, made by the man who has been cast unwittingly in the role of chief witness for those who oppose the operation of the T. V. A. Therefore, it is essential that we give as prominent space to the answer as to the original charges.

[From the Engineering News-Record, June 6, 1935]

PROPER ANSWER

Reports of the audit of T. V. A. operations that were presented before the Military Affairs Committee of the House last week by Comptroller General McCarl gave an unbelievable and, as the sequel proved, a scandalously misleading impression that the T. V. A.'s operations lack integrity and efficiency. It is therefore gratifying to learn that Arthur E. Morgan, Chairman of the Authority, answered the Comptroller General's charges point by point and thoroughly. One of the basic charges was that the wartime riot of expenditure for Wilson Dam, the Muscle Shoals nitrate plants, and associated properties was falsely written down on the T. V. A.'s books. This is an old canard. It would have been easy for the Comptroller General to verify the fact that the book value

represents sober, present-day, usable value. computed from the recorded construction quantities and actual present-day unit costs; yet, forgetting the responsible character of his office, he put forward figures implying that the T. V. A. had juggled its books to change an investment of more than \$130,000,000 to less than half that value. Engineers are interested also in the exceptions taken by the audit to purchases of construction equipment, where in many instances a bid other than the low bid was found to be best—quite within the law and within good engineering practice, but apparently not to the Comptroller General's taste. If governmental accounting rules stand in the way of considering quality of product and range of performance in comparing bids, then it is time that the rules were modernized.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Sunday, June 2, 1935]

ACCUSING THE T. V. A.

Among other things, Comptroller General McCarl accused the T. V. A. of letting of contracts without competitive bidding, reimbursement of traveling expenses of prospective employees, allowance of overtime to annual employees, allowance of charge for personally-owned motor vehicles without prior authorization, payment of pay rolls without administrative approval.

When President Roosevelt conceived the T. V. A., he said that it would "have the power of the Government and the initiative of a private corporation."

Because it has tried to realize the President's ideal, it has not had as much respect for redtape as the average Government bureau, and, therefore, it has demonstrated an efficiency which has won it success.

The T. V. A. has bought on a merit basis, if it has not always gone through the formality of advertising for bids. When it has wanted to interview a man possibly suited to a particular job, it has paid his expenses on the trip, just as a private business does; that's the way to get competent men, and the T. V. A. has gotten them.

Its submanagers, knowing that their superiors wanted them to get results quickly, didn't always bother their superiors, who they knew had confidence in them, by asking advance approval of everything they wanted to do; again this is the custom of efficient private corporations.

The essential thing is that T. V. A. should get its officials and employees on a merit, rather than a political, basis and that its policies should be sound. This has been true. Given that fundamental basis, T. V. A. should not be bound with unnecessary regulations.

Enemies of T. V. A. will want its hands tied with redtape; its friends will not.

Mr. McCarl's accusations only prove the soundness of T. V. A.'s practices. Here is a case where Government in business has proved businesslike.

We suggest that the watchdog of the Treasury bark up another tree.

Mr. Speaker, I have answered some of the things that have been said, and I hope in a respectful way—at least as respectfully as those who have said them. There is a tremendous amount of propaganda coming before this House and over the Nation to thwart the Tennessee Valley Authority and to defeat the utility holding company bill. I am not now speaking on the holding-company bill, but on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

We read in the anti-new-deal newspapers that it is socialism; we read that it is this and it is that; we read that it is everything in the world. But whatever they call it, let me tell what it is: The purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority, according to its present possibilities—and this is my opinion, not the interpretation of a law nor the interpretation of some formula that was made during the war time so we could win the war—is that the Tennessee Valley Authority is the greatest social program of this administration or any other administration in the history of the United States. Personally, I believe that it comes nearer meeting our economic questions and our economic problems than any other undertaking of the American people.

How in the world is a private company going to enter into a field and have soil-erosion work? Does it protect the public investment in its dams? If you will look into the hearings you will see where I asked the representatives of the Aluminum Co. of America, who desire to be wholly excluded from this act, what would they do in reference to soil erosion. Of course, they had to answer that they would do nothing whatever. How much reforestation is the Aluminum Co. of America going to do? How much is any private corporation going to do? Of course, none.

Anyone who knows anything at all knows that the only way that this can be accomplished is through governmental enterprise. If we are to save our farms and keep our country

from being washed away, we must have a national program, as of course it cannot be done either by private interests or private business, or by treaties of several different States, due to the fact that they would never make a treaty. Moreover, how are we going to preserve our forests? How are we going to make these forests so that we will have lumber in the future? How are we going to conserve our land? How are we going to make it so that they too do not wash away? In all these questions—in soil erosion, in reforestation, and conservation problems of all kinds—comes consideration of the fertility of the land, the ability to produce, the ability to bring forth corn and oats and other things, and if we do not do this our country will be so sterile that we cannot grow anything on it.

Now we will get to the subject of navigation, and when you are on navigation you are on flood control. And the only way you can have flood control and navigation is as a public proposition. You can navigate in the wide-open ocean, the Pacific, or the Gulf of Mexico, or the Atlantic, but you cannot navigate up and down rivers unless you have certain artificial works. These transcend State lines. They are big projects and cannot be done by private industry and, therefore, this navigation must be done by the Government. And in doing this we keep our land from being blown and washed away.

So now we get down to the most controversial subject, the fact that we are using money in order to get money back. It is a crime for the Government to spend money economically and make a good investment. It is all right for the power companies to make investments where they gouge the people out of their money, create a superstructure of holding companies to milk the investor, with salaries from each one of them to "gyp" the general public; but whenever the Government goes out and makes a sound investment, as they are making in the Tennessee Valley, where they will build power plants and sell power cheaper, pay better wages, and then get a return on the money, this, of course, aggravates and absolutely angers the Power Trust because they do not want the people to know that the Government can produce cheaper electricity than the Power Trust can and pay better wages and give better service. It is all in our philosophy of government. It is all an economic policy; an economic policy which the Democratic Party must face.

In speaking of such a great program as this, the enemies of this bill, and the conservation program of the Government, make long speeches about the T. V. A. cows—the foolishness of buying good cows to improve the breed down in those six or seven States. All I can say is, that when such a great, substantial work is considered, which will literally raise the standards of millions of people, that talking about cows is gnat snapping, fly slapping, and flea catching. Let us look at it as a big problem.

We were elected to serve the people. We were not elected for the purpose of getting profits for the power companies. Moreover, the country cannot stand it any longer.

T. V. A. ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority program is a particularly complicated one—due to its multiple and dovetailing phases—I have asked for, and have received from the Washington office of the Authority, a comprehensive word picture of T. V. A. activities to date, which, for the information of my colleagues and the public at large, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD:

In its 2 years of existence the Tennessee Valley development has recorded a progress that is commanding world attention. Yet it is a national job in particular. For, as President Roosevelt told the valley people on the occasion of his November 1934 visit to that area of activity, what is going on here is "an example which will be a benefit not only to yourselves but to the whole 130,000,000 Americans in every part of the land."

OUTSIDE BENEFITS

Preliminary benefits of this development to other areas are already manifest.

At least half of the \$45,000,000 spent for materials to date has been spread outside of the valley—profiting business in 35 States, from New England to the Pacific coast. A considerable portion of T. V. A.'s total pay-roll disbursement of \$17,000,000 has likewise found its way into national circulation.

By employing 15,000 persons locally the Authority is indirectly relieving unemployment in outside industrial centers which for-

merly drew many valley people unable to eke a livelihood at home. Every individual employed by T. V. A. means income and subsistence for three or more other persons.

Approximately 10,000 T. V. A. employees are engaged in construction and associated work. Norris and Wheeler Dams are now three-quarters and one-half completed, respectively, and a beginning has been made on Pickwick Landing Dam.

Meanwhile Wilson Dam is being operated for the immediate convenience of thousands of households and places of business in three States—Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee—which appreciate the advantages of cheap power. In addition to acquired facilities, about 200 miles of rural transmission lines have been erected and more are projected. More than 300 municipalities—from Oklahoma to Florida—have inquired into the possibilities of T. V. A. service.

At Muscle Shoals Nitrate Plant No. 2 a demonstration plant has gone into experimental production looking to new and better types of fertilizer materials which may ultimately be a direct gain to every farmer in the country. At the same time the Government is assured of a national-defense asset maintained in stand-by condition.

GENERAL

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act was approved May 18, 1933. The three directors of the T. V. A. held their first meeting June 14, 1933, at which time they constituted its sole personnel. Today a definite start has been made in the development and control of the Tennessee River and its tributaries for navigation, flood control, utilization of surplus power, and other purposes.

DAMS

Besides operating Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals and building Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, the Authority is conducting surveys looking to the full utilization of the Tennessee River's unified Federal hydroelectric development.

Construction of the Norris Dam (named for Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS) began October 3, 1933. The Wheeler Dam was authorized by President Roosevelt October 13, 1933. The Pickwick Landing Dam was authorized November 21, 1934.

The Norris Dam will cost about \$34,000,000, and the Wheeler Dam, without power installation, about \$20,000,000. The Norris Dam is on the Clinch River some 25 miles northwest of Knoxville, Tenn., and about 80 miles above the point where the Clinch River joins the Tennessee. The Wheeler barrier is on the Tennessee River, in Alabama, about 15½ miles upstream from the Wilson Dam. The Pickwick Landing Dam, to cost \$22,000,000, will rise near Shiloh Battlefield, in Tennessee, about 10 miles north of the Mississippi-Alabama State line. It will require about 3 years to build Pickwick Dam. Norris and Wheeler Dams will be completed in 1936.

These dams will not only help to regulate the flow of water on the upper Tennessee, in the interests of navigation and flood control both, but will serve also to provide additional power when needed.

POWER

In order to find an outlet for this present and potential horsepower, the T. V. A. is embarked on an elaborate electrification program. It has adopted power policies and established rate schedules as a "yardstick" for both public and private operation and has drafted exemplary rules and regulations governing the marketing of its power.

It has purchased or otherwise acquired private lines in certain areas in Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee to take care of the present power output of Wilson Dam. Purchase of approximately \$3,000,000 of property from the Alabama Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., and Tennessee Electric Power Co., in January 1934 gave T. V. A. immediate urban and rural markets in that area. On June 1, 1934, the T. V. A., on payment of \$850,700, acquired properties of the Mississippi Power Co. in certain counties in northern Mississippi.

In early February 1934 the T. V. A. began serving its first municipal customer—Tupelo, Miss. Today it is serving a total of 36 municipalities as well as rural homes in 14 counties in Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee.

Northeastern Mississippi is the center of T. V. A.'s rural electrification program—the first Federal venture of this nature. Here interested farmers have formed cooperatives to take advantage of T. V. A. power and rates. In one instance farmers in the county of Alcorn, Miss., are collaborating with the residents of the city of Corinth (that State) in making electric rate reductions average approximately 40 percent locally through a cooperative known as the "Alcorn County Electric Power Association."

Fourteen communities of northern Alabama, having attempted, without success, to purchase existing distribution facilities of the Alabama Power Co. in July 1934, formally signified willingness to join in a plan whereby T. V. A. would buy these plants and for a time operate them, pending amortization by the municipalities involved. These communities are: Florence, Sheffield, Tusculumbia, Courtland, Decatur, Falkville, Hartselle, Moulton, Red Bay, Russellville, Town Creek, Cherokee, Leighton, and Austinville. Due to legal and other obstructions which threatened to delay indefinitely the acquisition of the existing properties, the Authority, on December 14, 1934, withdrew its request that the Tri-Cities (Florence, Sheffield, and Tusculumbia) longer defer their original plans to build. But a Federal court restraining order has prevented them from so doing.

After negotiations extending over a period of several months, an agreement was reached in July 1934 between the T. V. A. and the National Power & Light Co. whereby the latter's electric

property in eastern Tennessee (Tennessee Public Service Co.) was to be acquired, under certain conditions, by the T. V. A. for \$6,000,000, with the idea of ultimately turning the properties over to the various municipalities involved for public operation. This is in line with the Authority's policy to avoid duplication of existing power systems wherever possible. Involved in this deal were Knoxville and 26 other communities. The agreement was approved by the power company stockholders, and by the Knoxville City Council, but litigation caused the deadline for the transaction to expire November 1, 1934, without the same being consummated.

Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Memphis are among the 27 municipalities which have voted on municipal ownership looking toward the use of T. V. A. power. Only five have registered in the negative.

APPLIANCES

In late May 1934 Tupelo saw the initial valley demonstration and sale of low-cost electrical appliances intended to go hand-in-hand with low rates in furthering the use of electricity. This phase of activity is under the Electric Home and Farm Authority. Created by Executive order, the E. H. F. A., with the cooperation of some 40 leading manufacturers of electrical appliances, plus 3 private power companies and 300 independent dealers, is making inexpensive electric ranges, refrigerators, water heaters, and farm pumps (other items to follow) available on long-term credit to the many persons—particularly rural—who, up to the present time, have been unable to afford such labor-saving devices. Prices are 25 to 35 percent lower. Many of these appliances have been placed on the national market, but for the time being E. H. F. A. financing is confined to low-power-rate areas, affecting 375,000 home users of electricity in parts of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee. (The E. H. F. A. neither manufactures nor sells appliances.)

SOIL EROSION

The building of dams would be transitory gestures unless coupled with reforestation and other steps to check destructive soil erosion in the contributing basins. The effective storage capacity of dams is prematurely affected by the washing of silt into the reservoirs. This filling-in process, as far as some sections of the Tennessee Valley are concerned, goes on at the rate of as much as 1 percent a year. The T. V. A. land program aims to protect the public investment in its dams, which will play such an important role toward controlling flood waters and adding to the navigation and power possibilities of the river system.

Terracing demonstrations in Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee have made many farmers erosion conscious and have led to the local initiation of cooperatives to promote soil recovery and conservation. Some 13,000 acres have been terraced to date. Such efforts offer an economical method of halting the Tennessee River and its tributaries from "running away with the soil" to the detriment of navigation and efficiency of dams.

Cooperating in the general program are 6,400 C. C. C. boys who have constructed 200,000 brush, log, bag, or stone dams, and have placed matting on 5,000,000 square yards of eroded lands. The latter method has been found less costly and equally efficient, besides requiring one-third the time. Tree nurseries have been established and millions of trees planted, including the blight-resistant Asiatic chestnut, to replace the doomed American variety. Also, a start has been made in cultivation of tree crops.

FERTILIZER

In line with land rehabilitation the T. V. A. is specifically authorized to develop new and better types of fertilizer materials. This it is doing, besides formulating better plans for fertilizer distribution. In November 1934 a pilot plant at Muscle Shoals went into experimental production of a phosphate product, a substance sorely needed by the soil. Some 20,000 tons of this material has since been made and is now being distributed to more than 500 valley farmers for demonstration work in cooperation with State and local agricultural agents. The objective is to develop processes that will cheapen plant food and increase its application by the farmers of the Nation, to whom dust storms and floods have become a very vital menace.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

A primary responsibility of the Authority is in relation to national defense. Its creative act specifies that nitrate plant no. 2 at Muscle Shoals shall be kept in stand-by condition in event of an emergency. This is being done. Experiments now being made there in connection with phosphate fertilizer will contribute substantially to the national-defense program. Studies also are being made for the development of deposits of manganese, another material valuable in war. The valley is rich in mineral resources of especial military use. It is near the center of population and within short haul of many industrial centers.

NAVIGATION

With the completion of Pickwick Landing Dam, a 7-foot channel will have been created from the mouth of the Tennessee River at Paducah, Ky., to Gunter'sville, Ala., a distance of 358 miles. Approximately 157 miles of this water highway, from Pickwick Landing Dam to Gunter'sville, will have a 9-foot channel. The ultimate objective is a 9-foot channel from the Ohio River to Knoxville, Tenn., a river route of 652 miles. These long-needed navigation facilities that will be instrumental in opening the rich mineral and other natural resources of the valley to the mutual advantage of residents and an outside world.

FLOOD CONTROL

Closely allied with navigation and power development is flood control. The energy of Wilson Dam, for example, depends upon

water fluctuation. At the present time low water may mean a decrease to one-seventh of its rated energy. The Norris Dam will tend to correct this by releasing water in dry season and storing it at other times. In doing so it will help reduce the flood menace in the Tennessee Valley, which now does \$2,000,000 damage yearly. An integrated system of dams, such as planned by the T. V. A., will, in addition to opening new sources of power when needed, have indirect bearing on the flood hazard on the Mississippi River as well.

TRAINING

Because jobs on the dams go to the local jobless, the Authority employs more workmen than would otherwise be needed. These men, mostly from regions where agriculture yields meager returns, are employed half time with opportunity to benefit themselves by the training—also educational—courses provided for their spare time. They learn how to carry on useful occupations when they return to their homes. Such instruction not only results in more efficient work on the dams but, at the end of the construction period, will provide skilled workers for neighborhoods which heretofore have had none.

NORRIS TOWN

The T. V. A. built town of Norris, near the dam of the same name, comprises a distinctive and practical community. Here are housed families of workers on the dam or allied projects. The 350 dwellings are electrically equipped—more than one-third of them include electric heat—and represent stone, frame, or cinder-block construction. Rents range from \$12.50 to \$45 a month, with the lower brackets predominating. There is a school and cooperative store. Within the town confines are parks and a forest preserve, also community gardens, a demonstration farm, training center, and the construction camp proper. The latter is planned to fit into the industrial life of the community after the dam is completed.

There is a much smaller community at Wheeler Dam, and another small town is being built at Pickwick Landing Dam. The Muscle Shoals properties include three residential groups built prior to T. V. A. occupation.

COOPERATIVES

On January 24, 1934, there was incorporated in Knox County, Tenn., the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, which is interested in sponsoring cooperatives for the benefit of the valley people. It was allocated \$300,000 by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration with which to begin operations. To date it has launched about a dozen cooperatives affecting some 8,000 families. Some of these activities are in mountain communities where as many as 70 percent of the people were on relief. The projects embrace fruit, berry, and vegetable canning; seed-potato cultivation, flour grinding, dairying, and handicraft textiles.

These and other activities in the Tennessee Valley afford visual evidence of a multiphased regional development which gives promise of not only returning national dividends on the war-time \$127,000,000 investment at Muscle Shoals but, at the same time, points the way toward America's "planned future." For, as President Roosevelt says, "If we are successful here we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION—COMMERCIAL AIRPORT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the lady from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have some time on this matter.

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think there is anyone on this side who has requested time or who objects to the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is in charge of the time on the other side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to preface my remarks upon the pending legislation by saying that personally I believe the time has come in America when we, as Members of Congress, should cease to vote huge appropriations of billions of dollars for warships and obsolete fighting equipment at the expense of the aviation of this Nation. We should encourage commercial aviation as a second line of our defense in this Republic. I bring this to the attention of the membership at this time simply to state that America must not lag behind in its appropriations for defense from the air, in view of the huge appropriations which we seem determined to continue to make.

That brings me to a discussion of the aviation needs of the Capital City of this land. Your subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia conducted hearings over a period of weeks upon the Gravelly Point airport measure. This committee heard a great many witnesses who came before it, speaking in favor of the Gravelly Point air site, the Washington-Hoover Airport as it now exists, and a great many other sites for airports in the District of Columbia and adjacent territory. Out of those hearings there came a belief on the part of the committee that what was advisable at this time was for the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would bring the airport situation to the attention of the people of the District of Columbia in a way that definite action might be taken at this session of the Congress.

At this point permit me to say that the committee had no definite idea as to any particular site. I am certain that the members of the subcommittee and the District Committee today do not come here in connection with this legislation in favor of or against any certain airport site which was to be considered.

I should like at this time to turn to page 50 of the hearings on the airport bill and read a few sentences which were expressed by Rex Martin, the Assistant Director of the Bureau of Air Commerce of the Department of Commerce. I asked Mr. Martin this question:

Before you leave the stand, going back to your tour of Europe in the last few months, I would like for you to state for the committee how far, in your opinion, we lag behind, here at the National Capital, in comparison with other capitals of the world, from the standpoint of aviation facilities.

Mr. Martin replied:

It would be like comparing a chicken yard with a Texas range in size, mostly. While Tempelhof and Le Bourget are not extraordinary, they are bigger. They have no airport at The Hague, in Holland. They have a very fine one at Amsterdam, a very good one at Rotterdam, and the airport at Brussels is superior in every way.

Think of it! The airport of little Belgium is superior in every way to ours. He said further:

The airport at Croydon, England, is superior by far. The one that they are presently using at Rio de Janeiro is, I think, better, though it is not well located. The new one that they have there will be extraordinary. The airport in Rome is better. The one in Venice is not better.

Then he goes on to say:

Any number of cities of Europe have better facilities than we have—Munich and Stuttgart; even the little town of Friedrichshafen has a better airport.

Then Mr. Nichols, a member of the subcommittee, asked Mr. Martin:

There are many cities in the United States that have airports superior to Washington's, are there not?

And he said:

Quite a number.

Now, that is the testimony given by Mr. Martin, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Air Commerce, as shown by the hearings.

I now come to the testimony, very briefly, of Edward V. Rickenbacker, who is one of the leading aviation authorities of this Nation. This is what he said upon the stand, speaking of the present facilities at Washington:

It is without doubt one of the most hazardous airports in this country for the number of schedules coming in and out with the type of equipment that is being used, and I think it is truly remarkable that there has not been a serious accident. In fact, it is one of my worries 24 hours of the day every day. It is almost expected all the time. I would not be surprised at any time to hear of a very fatal collision. It would not be news to me.

I bring these two opinions to you from high authority about the need of an airport with adequate facilities for the District of Columbia now. We believe that in this pending legislation we have presented a way whereby we shall not have one group arguing for a certain airport and another group arguing for another site, but that we shall create a commission to choose a site for the establishment and development of a commercial airport for the District of Columbia.

This commission is to consist of seven members, as follows: First, the Director of Aeronautics of the Department of Commerce, Mr. Vidal; the Second Assistant Postmaster General, in this case Mr. Branch; a Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be the chairman, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; a United States Senator, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; an appointee of the air transport companies serving the city of Washington, and let us remember in this connection that there are nine schedules running in and out of Washington every day and that the number is going to be increased in the very near future; one member from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to be selected by the Board; and Amelia Earhart Putnam, internationally known aviatrix. Some one may ask why we have selected a woman to act on this commission. I may say, because I see the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. O'Day] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] in the Chamber at the present time, that we believe that women have taken their place not only in some avenues of endeavor, but in practically all the avenues of worthwhile endeavor in America today, so we felt that this woman should be given an opportunity of serving the District of Columbia and the Nation as well.

The members of this commission will receive no salary but provision is made to reimburse them for actual expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties. This commission is to be empowered and instructed to make a survey of the best possible sites in the District of Columbia, keeping in mind always the large amount of testimony from various commissions which have investigated this question over a period perhaps of the last 10 or 12 years. It is further provided that the action of a majority of the members of the commission shall constitute the action of the commission. After a site has been selected the duties of the commission automatically cease. Within 30 days after the first commission has concluded its service by selecting a site, there is to be appointed a second commission, to be known as the "Washington Airport Commission", to provide for the actual administration of the site which has been chosen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The President of the United States, by and with the consent of the United States Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to create a commission to establish and operate this public airport for the city of Washington and the District of Columbia.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think the gentleman omitted one phase of the proceedings, and that is that the second commission, appointed by the President of the United States, will have as its duty the acquisition of the site recommended by the first commission. In other words, the first commission does not acquire a site; it simply selects the site. It is the President's commission, appointed for a term of years, which acquires and purchases the site, and administers it after its acquisition.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma; he is entirely correct. I may say further in this connection that the committee which is to select the site, of

course, takes into consideration the prime factors, that is the time of completion, the cost of the enterprise, the safety of the field, and its proximity to the city of Washington.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Is this airport to be used by private air transportation companies?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is to be for the use of commercial enterprise; every type of air transportation.

Mr. COLDEN. Why should the District of Columbia and the Federal Government furnish an airport for the use of commercial companies? Is it done in any other city?

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. As a matter of fact, airports are furnished in nearly every instance by the cities, towns, or municipalities in which they are located, and in no case do the transport companies build them. The cost of maintaining the airports, however, is taken care of out of revenues derived from charges on transport companies for the use of the field, rentals, and hangar space. Over a period of years they even show a profit.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman. Does that answer the inquiry of the gentleman from California?

Mr. COLDEN. I should like to say to the gentleman that at one time I was a member of the City Council of Los Angeles. We were inveigled into buying an airport on the theory that it would be self-supporting; but it proved to be a failure.

Mr. NICHOLS. That might be true.

Mr. RANDOLPH. How long ago was that?

Mr. COLDEN. That was in 1928 or 1929. It has proved to be a disappointment and a costly item to the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The acquisition of an airport should be looked at also from the standpoint of national defense should it not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. We feel that not only are we serving the District of Columbia but also the Nation's Capital when we provide ample airport facilities.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Which could be used for the protection of the National Capitol if necessary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLDEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to add in this respect that the Los Angeles Airport has been a failure. Private companies refused to use it and built their own airport, which they maintain themselves.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There has been, of course, a rapid development of aviation within the period since the city of Los Angeles had its experience. Even in my little city in West Virginia we have a municipal airport. This is true, of course, in all the largest cities of the United States.

To continue with the make-up of this commission: The members are to be selected by the President, three in number. The first commissioners are to be appointed for a term of 2 years, 4 years, and 6 years, respectively, the President having the right, of course, to designate the chairman of the commission.

The said commission, or a majority of them, shall have the power to elect a manager for the airport hereinafter to be acquired and all officers and agents thereof and to make needful rules and regulations, subject to the laws and to the rules of the Department of Commerce regarding aviation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman state to the Members of the House the necessity for these two commissions?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say to the gentleman that the District Committee members felt they wanted a commission

simply to act from the standpoint of the selection of a site, with no entangling alliances connected therewith. This commission would receive, as I previously stated, no salary, and would act only until the selection of the site had been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Following that, under section 4 it is stated within 30 days after the selection of the site by the first commission there shall be a second commission appointed, to be known as the "Washington Airport Commission." There is delegated to the President of the United States authority to create and select this commission. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he believes the second commission would be involved in any entangling alliances in connection with the selection of this airport?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; I do not mean that. The first commission, if and when set up, would only function until the actual site was picked; then that commission's power would automatically cease.

There may be a question in the minds of the Members as to the necessity for these two commissions, but we believe there should be a permanent commission functioning in Washington, D. C., for the control and regulation of airport facilities. Section 8 of the legislation provides that a sum not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be made available for the purchase of the land and improvements.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I introduced this airport bill, and I stand here this morning in the peculiar position of being opposed to a bill which bears my name. If the Members will look at the bill as now presented to the House, they will find that the committee struck out everything after the enacting clause and inserted an entirely new bill.

In this new bill the committee erects a double-headed monster in the form of two commissions to decide, first, where the airport shall be built, and then the other to build and operate the airport. May I say at the outset that I favor a proper, safe airport for the District of Columbia. I have been interested in this matter for several sessions of Congress. It has been investigated by, I would say, at least six committees of the Congress as to where the airport should be placed. The agency in Washington that knows more about where an airport ought to be built than the individual Members of Congress, who can give this matter but little time, is the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission, which has been set up for the purpose of determining just this sort of question.

There are only two sites that have ever been given serious consideration. One is what is known as the "Gravelly Point" site, which is under water. It has to be filled in. This site is favored by the National Capitol Park and Planning Commission and a large number of other agencies, the names of which I shall give you presently. They have constantly and repeatedly urged the adoption of this site. The other site is the Washington-Hoover Airport, the existing airport across the Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge. Ultimately, when an airport is selected for the District of Columbia, I believe it will be one of these two sites. The committee reports against the Gravelly Point site. I think this Congress should prohibit by proper amendment to this bill the selection of the Washington-Hoover site, and I will tell the Members why. Every time an effort is made to erect an airport in the District of Columbia, a gentleman by the name of Soloman appears and monopolizes the time of the committee. Mr. Soloman is an officer of the Washington-Hoover Airport Co. The Washington-Hoover Airport was sold under deed of trust some years ago for something like \$600,000. The airport company state that they had a lot of money in the project prior to that time, which brought their total cost up to \$1,600,000. This may be entirely true, and I do not question the statement, because I do not know. However, when it was put under the hammer and knocked down at public auction, it brought six-hundred-and-some-odd thousand dollars. Whenever a question is raised about

purchasing the site from this company, the white elephant they have on their hands, the price mentioned is anywhere from \$1,600,000 on up.

Mr. EAGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EAGLE. Yet the plot of ground over there is not big enough to land a good apple cart on?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have not got to that feature as yet.

If we set up an unofficial commission with the power to buy this property, and they will have this power under the present bill unless a limitation is put therein, there is the possibility—and I may say the strong probability—that the present Washington-Hoover Airport will be selected and we will be buying that land for \$17,400 per acre.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would the gentleman favor eliminating both Gravelly Point and the Washington-Hoover Airport?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the committee will agree to such an amendment, I will conclude my argument immediately and withdraw my opposition to the bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Personally I believe that neither of the places mentioned are suitable for an airport.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Understand that the subcommittee is not favoring the Washington-Hoover Airport. They are giving full power to the commission to make the selection. My fear is not of the subcommittee. My fear is of this unofficial commission that is going to be set up to spend two and a half million dollars of our money. If we are going to spend two and a half million dollars, let us investigate the matter and make our own selection and say where the airport should be located.

I now want to tell you about the size of the Washington-Hoover Airport. The previous hearings on the Washington-Hoover Airport show that it is not large enough, and that it is unsafe and cannot be made safe unless it is enlarged and unless it takes in a part of the Arlington Experimental Farm.

This bill contains a provision making it mandatory upon any department of the Government to turn over to them any part of their land which may be needed to make a sufficiently large airport at this point. If they select the Washington-Hoover Airport they have got to have a large slice out of the Arlington Experimental Farm.

Now, let us see what the Department of Agriculture says about this. Here is a letter written to the committee during a former hearing by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hyde. When they wrote to him and asked whether the Arlington Experimental Farm could spare a portion of its land in order to make this a competent airport, he replied:

As there is no other portion of Arlington Farm suitable in topography and soil character for much of this type of this experimental work, its abandonment for that purpose on short notice would irreparably damage the plant research programs of the Bureau of Plant Industry and seriously interfere with related work of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils.

Then, in conclusion, he states:

If Congress should authorize the transfer of this 50-acre portion of Arlington Farm for other uses, the question of relocation and the provision of funds necessary to accomplish this would be immediately precipitated and even if authority and funds for relocation were available, several years would be required for the physical transfer to a new site without serious loss to the public of results of experimental work now under way.

In view of the existing situation, this Department could not look with favor on the transfer of the land in question.

It is absolutely essential that they should have a portion of Arlington Experimental Farm in order to build an adequate airport on this property for which it is proposed to pay \$17,400 an acre.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. EAGLE. In the event that 50 acres of the Arlington plat be added to the present little patch there, would not the great concrete highway which runs through there disrupt and interrupt the traffic?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; the heaviest route in the United States, which is U. S. No. 1, runs right along beside the present airport and is a constant menace and will always be a constant menace to those who travel by plane, as well as those who travel otherwise; then the Military Road bisects the field, and traffic lights are maintained to warn of approaching planes.

Mr. EAGLE. I may say to the gentleman that I so completely share his view that in flying up from Texas this week-end I declined to leave at a time that would put our ship down here after dark, because I knew it would be unusually dangerous.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The committee in its report did recommend that Military Road be closed immediately, did it not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not speaking of Military Road. There is one road just to the side of it and one road that runs right through the middle of it. They will have to close Military Road, which is the road used to get to the Experimental Farm, in order to establish an airport there that will be safe under any conditions.

Now, what I want the committee to do, when we reach the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule, is to put in an amendment that will change the personnel of this commission. I would also like you to put in an amendment that will cut out the clause which would permit this unofficial commission to take away from the Department of Agriculture a part of the Arlington Experimental Farm, far more important to the people of this country than the matter of whether they ever have an airport in the city of Washington or not. I should also like for the committee to put into the bill an amendment limiting this commission to \$1,000,000 for the purchase of the land for this airport. You know you can go out here and get plenty of land for an airport for \$1,000,000. If you limit it to \$1,000,000, then you cut out this Washington-Hoover Airport Co. that is trying to sell its property to the Government for \$17,400 an acre.

May I say on behalf of Arlington County, where this property is situated, that I have a resolution which I should like to put in the Record, from the county board of that county, which is the governing board of the county, in which they petition the Congress not to permit the Government to purchase this airport and deprive them of a very large chunk of taxes which they get every year from this property. I think the committee will feel that this local community, where this project is being placed, ought to be entitled to some consideration, particularly when you realize that it is a drain upon their taxes of \$7,500 per year if you take this property out of taxation by selling it to the Government.

I now want to call attention further, if I have the time, to a matter with respect to the Gravelly Point site, and I am not making an argument for Gravelly Point. As I said in reply to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], if this committee will agree to an amendment excluding both the Gravelly Point site and the Washington-Hoover Airport site from this bill, I will withdraw my objection to it this minute, but I do not believe the committee is going to pass a bill which leaves it in the power of an unofficial commission to permit this Washington-Hoover Airport Co. to sell their white elephant to the United States Congress for \$17,400 an acre.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I understand, if this bill passes, they will not have to come back to Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; if this bill passes, this unofficial commission selects the site and their say is final.

The only thing left for commission no. 2 to do is to build the airport and operate it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the gentleman give the Members of the House any basic or fundamental reason why two commissions should be set up here to negotiate this matter?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot. I am violently opposed to that and I hope the committee will not adopt the amendment reported by the committee when it is offered to the House.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the selection of a proper site for an air mail terminus. I can recollect very vividly when we initiated the first transcontinental air line that we had great difficulty in setting up landing fields from the Atlantic to the Pacific. At that time the Government sent out high-pressure salesmen to interest parties in the selection and establishment of air fields, and for many years afterward complaints were made that the Government either refused to land on the field or that the company or individual that set up the field was anxious to dispose of it to the Government. This advance selection of airport sites has not always proved advantageous in view of later developments.

If we decide to abandon the present facilities for an airport 20 miles away, we might have a white elephant on our hands 5 years from now, due to the ever-changing transportation service.

The present field is certainly a hazardous one. It is so regarded by the experts of every country. It is particularly hazardous for ships flying into the field, and should be changed and changed at once.

I have no objection to the bill or the details of the bill before us, but I really believe that the proper procedure for Congress to follow would be to establish an airport where it is now located.

From all opinion it is the best located airport of any city in the United States, and I have flown into a number of them. It is the best location because it is just across the river from the city. It is near the post office and within 5 minutes of the business center.

These airplanes carry passengers, express, and mail, and if there is delay in the transportation and delivery after the plane has landed that must be taken into consideration.

The Washington-Hoover Airport is the most convenient location, and its improvement can be brought about without much delay by eliminating the Military Road running through the center, eliminating the temporary bathing beach and filling up the adjacent lagoon, and turning over to the airport a portion of the Government's experimental farm land.

A C. C. C. camp could go into the Washington-Hoover Airport and put it in condition within 60 days for flying under maximum safeguards.

Mr. McFARLANE. Can we not change the name of that airport?

Mr. MEAD. Call it the "new deal" airport. [Laughter.] If we select a site 10, 15, or 20 miles away, we will have to put up with this hazardous situation until the construction of the other airport is completed. If we improve the present airport, we will have the best located airport in the United States and one that is free from hazards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, we have an excellent site, and we will not have to worry about the price because, as I understand it, the commission created by the terms of this legislation has the authority to condemn the land.

I want to make this one closing observation. The size is ideal; it can be improved, and it affords an opportunity for Washington to have a real airport. We talk about airports

in other cities and in other countries; it must be remembered that this is only one of three or four airports that we have in the city of Washington. We have the Army airport, the marine airport, one or two private airports, but the Washington-Hoover Airport improved, as I have suggested, will make a splendid airport, unequaled in many respects by that of any other city in the United States, because of its being so close to the very heart of the city of Washington.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does not the gentleman believe that as long as we have this name attached to this airport, there is going to continue to be a hazard. Its name ought to be changed, and I suggest that this committee change the name of the airport and relieve us from that hazard.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would it make much difference in getting to and from an airport if it took 2 or 3 minutes longer, provided you have better landing facilities?

Mr. MEAD. Two or three minutes would be all right, but I understand the other sites are more than 2 or 3 minutes further away.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We investigated sites here and there was a difference of only 2 or 3 minutes in locating a site that was cheaper and more reasonable.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Permit me to suggest that some 48 sites have been presented to various committees for consideration.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I took this matter up with a number of the men who fly into the airport, who use the airport, and this is what they say: If the Military Road were taken out and part of the experimental farm turned over by the Federal Government to the airport, so that they could clear the ground and move the hangars back, it would be a very excellent field and would probably cost only one-quarter of the maximum included in this bill. [Applause.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this bill has gone off on the wrong premise. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has injected into this a proposition that would lead you to believe that this is a consideration for the location of a site, as between Gravelly Point and the Washington-Hoover Airport. That is strictly and entirely not the situation. The merits of the two sites are simply two things that will enter into the consideration of this first-named commission. They will consider every site, and the testimony in the hearings shows that there are some 45 in close proximity to the District of Columbia available for airports for the District of Columbia. The gentleman rather impugns the motive of somebody. Let us see what this commission is; let us see if there is any danger from this commission. Who are they? No. 1 is the Director of Aeronautics of the Department of Commerce. Where is the man who is going to rise and say that he has some selfish interest as between one and another airport? He will be a member of the commission. No. 2 is the Assistant Postmaster General. He is in charge of air mail. Who is the man or woman in this House who will say that he has a selfish interest in the selection of a site for an airport? He is to be a member of the commission. No. 3 is a Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be chairman, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. Where is the man who is going to say that he has a selfish motive in the selection of this site, which can be selected from all the world—a Member of your own body, to be picked by the Speaker? No. 4 is a United States Senator, who is appointed by the President of the Senate. Is he going to be a "fixed" member of this commission?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Will anybody have time to explain to the committee members why it is that the Government is buying and why it is that the District of Columbia is not buying this airport?

Mr. NICHOLS. I shall answer that, but let me finish with this first. The fifth member of the commission is to be an appointee of the air-transport companies serving the city of Washington. Who is more interested in an adequate airport, one which will be located properly, one which will furnish every facility for landing, than the companies who pay for the support and upkeep in rental of this airport?

Do you think they are going to be swayed as between a location in Virginia and one in Maryland, or do you think they are going to protect their business interest, whose interests are identical with the interests to be served by this airport? Another member of the commission is a member of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Who is going to impugn his motives? Where is the man that is going to say that he is a "fixed" member of the commission? Then there is Amelia Earhart Putnam. Certainly she knows how to fly an airplane and she has been in and out of airports. Who is there among the Membership who will assert that she will be a "fixed" member for the selection of an airport?

Let us go on. There will be two more, one a member of the Park and Planning Commission of the District of Columbia. This will be offered as a committee amendment and I trust it will be adopted. A member of the Park and Planning Commission of the District of Columbia. Is he going to be a fixed member of the commission, in favor of some particular site?

Another, a member of the board of trade, who represents the business interests of the District of Columbia. Will he go on the commission, fixed against one site or another? If it is possible to select a fairer commission, a fairer cross-cut of the representatives who are interested in this important matter, I do not know how it can be done. The only interest of the subcommittee in the consideration of this bill was to select a commission of which no one could be suspicious after they had selected a site.

In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as to why it was necessary to create two commissions, permit me to say it is necessary to create two commissions so that there will be obviated every chance of someone suggesting graft or frame-up. The first commission is a nonsalaried commission. It selects the site. We do not leave it in their hands to purchase the site and spend the money. We take it out of their consideration. They are discharged. They are no longer in the picture. Then we ask the President of the United States to appoint a commission of three who shall serve for a term of years at a per diem and expenses, not only to purchase a site but to operate and maintain the site. If any Member can think of a fairer plan, let him suggest it.

The gentleman from California asked, "Why should the Government pay anything on this airport?" The Government should pay its proportionate part of the construction and maintenance of this airport principally because it will receive equal benefits from it with the District of Columbia. A further reason why the Government should pay part of it is that this airport will be located in the Capital of the United States, a Capital that is rapidly becoming the Capital of the world, and in this Capital City of this Nation there should be an airport second to none in the entire world.

The Government does not land its air mail down on the Government landing field. You can take a bucket of water and stick an airplane down in that flat across from Gravelly Point. The Government is not going to lose any money. They put up the money, and then after 10 years the District of Columbia pays them back 50 percent of the money with 3-percent interest. Then the District of Columbia and the Government contribute equally, 50 percent each, to the maintenance of the airport. The Government and the District of Columbia share equally, 50 percent each, in the revenues that come from the airport. I know the gentleman from Texas, TOM BLANTON, is going to ask me if there is

going to be any profit. I do not know whether there is going to be any profit or not.

Mr. BLANTON. There will not be any.

Mr. NICHOLS. Very well; probably not.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. In the gentleman's own home town there is an airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. No. I am a country boy. I live in a town of only 3,000 people.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Well, we have one and we support it ourselves and we paid for it. I cannot vote for this bill, because I do not see that the Government's contribution is necessary.

Mr. COLDEN. And the taxpayers pay the bill, too, if it is not self-supporting.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman says his city built an airport and paid the expense of it. I presume that somebody in that city thought they needed an airport. Because they needed it they took the money from the city and paid for it and built it, and they should have done so. Now, does Washington, with the ever-present problem of national defense looking her in the face—

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Oh, she has the Army and the Navy.

Mr. NICHOLS. I did not yield to the gentleman, but when it rains the Army and the Navy land their airplanes at the Washington-Hoover Airport today. The Army and Navy field is down in the flats. It is on made land. The water has never settled out of that land. It is still seepy and boggy. You can land an airplane and take a tub of water and stick it tight to the ground on the Army and Navy field. This airport should be located in a field that is high and dry and not in a spot of made land taken from the bottom of the river, as was the present site of the Army airport.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. What would happen to Gravelly Point, if it was selected, on that score?

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not care to go into that, but the hearings are full of the testimony of experts on the subject. The testimony is that it will take from 1 to 40 years in the first place to complete it; that it will take from 1 to 5 years for it to settle and for the water to seep out of it. I have no interest in where the airport is. I do not care. But we sat for 3 weeks on this subcommittee listening to every available witness, and we have come here to you with a bill giving our best and mature judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is just one real consideration in this bill, as I see it, and that is the question of whether or not the Congress thinks that the District of Columbia should have an adequate airport. No one who testified before our subcommittee even suggested that we had ample commercial landing facilities. No one who has ever landed either on the Washington or the Hoover field under present conditions, with Military Road splitting that field in two, will say that we have adequate landing facilities. Regardless of whether you like it or not, aviation is going forward. This country is rapidly becoming air-minded. The leading cities and communities in these United States are providing facilities with which they can take care of the march of progress, which is now being led by the rapid strides made in aviation.

The most rapid mail transportation today is carried on by means of airplanes. We should furnish the Post Office Department of this Government a place in the city of Washington where commercial ships can land the air mails. Private companies, if you please, have contracts from your Government and from my Government, to carry the mail. The Government does not provide them with landing facilities at the Army and Navy fields. The Government pays the private companies to carry the mail and it is up to the company to put the mail down at its own expense.

Visitors who come to the city of Washington on business, which they think should be expedited to the extent of their flying here, have the right to expect and know that they will be set down in an airplane in the city of Washington at a port where every care has been taken to protect their safety.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is the gentleman's opinion, then, that any airport constructed in the District of Columbia would serve not only the District of Columbia but also the Nation?

Mr. NICHOLS. Certainly, and it would serve every governmental department here.

I want to close with this statement. As I said before, this is a matter that has been before the House for at least two sessions; not this bill, but the question of an airport for Washington. This subcommittee sat for weeks and weeks and heard everybody whom we thought could throw any light on the subject. I sincerely hope the Committee of the Whole will pass this bill. No one has cried a great deal about expense. If you want to impugn the motives of this commission, all right; if you think there is a fairer commission that can be selected, let us try it; but if you want an airport for the city of Washington vote for this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is only one feature of this bill to which I object, and that is the feature requiring the Government of the United States to pay half of the expenses of purchasing this field and of maintaining it, and for it to provide all of the money and then wait 10 years before half of it is paid back. We have two fields of our own here in the District of Columbia, two landing fields owned by the United States Government, bought by the United States Government, and maintained by the United States Government, one for the Army and one for the Navy, and we do not need any interest in this field. This is a District of Columbia city field, just like the city field we have at Abilene, Tex.—and we have one of the finest landing fields in the United States in my home city, a double A-1 field where planes land regularly every day, mail planes, Army planes, passenger planes, private planes, every kind of plane. It is an all-weather field. When the people in the district of my friend from South Carolina want a field they buy and build it. When our friends from New York want fields they build them, they pay for them, and they maintain them.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry not to yield, but I want to use my few minutes myself.

Mr. Chairman, why should our taxpayers back home put up the money for this municipal Washington field? Our distinguished friends on this committee are very generous with the American taxpayers' money. They take it all out of the Public Treasury. None of it is to be paid back for 10 years. For 10 years the people of the District get the benefit of it and then begin paying back so much a year for 4 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not now; I am sorry I haven't the time. When the gentleman goes home I want him to tell his people back home that for 75 years they have been taxed not only for their own civic enterprises at home but they were taxed also to bear 50 percent of the cost of the local civic government here in Washington, respecting all the public improvements in Washington, until in late years we stopped it. During those years the people in the 48 States paid 50 percent of the water system, the light system, the school buildings, the playgrounds, the bridges—the million-dollar bridge out here on Connecticut Avenue and the \$3,500,000 Key Bridge. They helped to pay for all these civic improvements here, embracing 1,200 parks in Washington used for the pleasure and benefit of the people of Washington. The people back home do not get any benefit of these things unless they make a trip to Washington and visit here for a

few days. I am getting tired of seeing the taxpayers back home mulcted and almost ruined by overtaxation when they can hardly pay their own expenses, when they are already overburdened with taxes, when they have to pay all of their own civic expenses back home.

We should strike out the provision requiring the Government to pay any part of this expense. I am with our distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from New Jersey in providing Washington with an airport. She wants a nice airplane field here, and so do I; but I want to let the people of Washington pay for their own field.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. If the gentleman will help me get a bill through Congress giving the franchise to the people of Washington I will go along with him in some of his efforts.

Mr. BLANTON. Franchise for what?

Mrs. NORTON. A franchise to vote, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. What, against the Constitution! A bill was passed through Congress in 1871 giving the people of Washington the right to vote, but the Supreme Court held they did not have that right under the Constitution, and in 1874 Congress took it away again; but in the meantime they got into debt so far that it almost bankrupted the Nation to pay them out. We paid them out then but we provided also that if any official of the District of Columbia ever again should borrow another dollar he should be put in the penitentiary for a long term of years.

Why did Congress do that? They did it because they did not want this Nation's Capital to get into debt.

Mrs. NORTON. Does not the gentleman know that the Government has given 30 percent of the vast public-works fund as grants to the people throughout this country?

Mr. BLANTON. And the people of Washington have gotten their full proportion of all P. W. A. grants, and have already received their 30-percent donations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider the substitute committee amendment as an original bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentlewoman from New Jersey means to consider the committee substitute amendment as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. In other words that it shall be read by sections and amendments shall be in order at the end of each section?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. At the conclusion of the reading of this amendment, will it then be in order to vote upon the adoption of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will have to vote upon the committee substitute amendment.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That there is hereby created a commission to choose a site for the establishment and development of a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; said commission to consist of seven persons, as follows: The Director of Aeronautics of the Department of Commerce; the Second Assistant Postmaster General; a Member of the House of Representatives, who shall be chairman, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; a United States Senator, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and an appointee of the air transport companies serving the city of Washington; one member from the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, to be selected by said Board; and Amelia Earhart Putnam, internationally known aviatrix. Said commission shall receive no salary, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses of travel incurred in the discharge of official duties herein prescribed."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mrs. NORTON: On page 4, line 18, strike out the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

On page 5, line 2, after the semicolon, strike out the word "and."
On page 5, line 3, after the word "aviatrix", strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following language: "an appointee of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and an appointee of the Board of Trade of the District of Columbia."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the latter amendment is offered in order to give the people of the District of Columbia greater representation on this commission and is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 4, line 18, after the word "persons", strike out down to the period on line 3, page 5, and insert the following: "To be appointed by the President."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the difference between this amendment and the original bill is that instead of naming various and sundry individuals, officials, and others, as is done in the bill, the selection of the committee is left to the appointment of the President of the United States. That is all it does. It strikes out all of that part which says that so-and-so, Amelia Earhart, and somebody else shall be appointed to the commission, and directs the President of the United States to appoint the members of the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Said commission is hereby instructed and empowered to make a survey of possible and practical sites and to study testimony submitted in the various congressional hearings conducted on this subject. Said commission is further instructed and empowered to choose a site for the establishment and development of a commercial airport, taking into consideration as prime factors, the questions of time of completion, cost of the enterprise, safety, and the proximity to the community to be served.

SEC. 3. After a site has been selected by the said commission (and it is hereby ordered that the action of a majority of the members of the commission shall constitute the action of the commission), the duties and powers of the commission for the selection of said site shall end.

SEC. 4. Within 30 days after the selection of the site by the commission, which shall be known as the "Washington Airport Commission", as above provided for, the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the United States Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to create a commission to establish and operate a public airport at Washington, D. C., to consist of three persons, to be appointed by him, and the first commissioners so appointed shall hold office for the terms of 2 years, 4 years, and 6 years, respectively, and until their successors shall have been appointed and qualified, and thereafter every commissioner appointed to succeed said commissioners shall be appointed for the full term of 6 years, and the President shall designate which one of said commissioners shall be chairman. Any vacancy created by death, resignation, or dismissal, or otherwise, shall be filled for the period of such vacancy only, and all such appointments shall be confirmed by the Senate of the United States. Said commissioners shall receive no salary, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses of travel incurred in the discharge of official duties, and shall reside within 10 miles of the Capital of the United States.

SEC. 5. Said Commission, or a majority of them, shall have power to elect a manager for the airport hereinafter to be acquired, and all other officers and agents thereof, and to make all needful rules and regulations, subject to the law and to conform to the rules of the Department of Commerce regarding aviation.

SEC. 6. The said Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to acquire the property selected by the Washington Airport Commission first provided for in this act, together with all rights, privileges, and easements incident to same, and if, after private negotiation, a satisfactory price therefor cannot be agreed upon, then the said Commission is hereby authorized and required to give notice that said property is needed for public purposes and that the same will be condemned, and accordingly the same shall be condemned, and the condemnation proceedings shall conform as nearly as may be to the proceedings authorized and set up in the act of Congress approved May 18, 1933, known as "An act to create the Tennessee Valley Authority", and said

provisions of said act are hereby incorporated into and shall become a part of this act.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood because of the remarks I made heretofore as being opposed to the District of Columbia getting an airport. I think I realize as fully as any member of the committee that the District of Columbia needs a commercial airport, but I have not been convinced after listening to the arguments made this morning that the United States Government should contribute the amount that it is proposed to contribute by this bill to the erection of this airport, the building of it and its continued maintenance throughout the years. This final commission is authorized to contribute for the Government one-half of the expense of the airport.

Mr. Chairman, it is no argument to tell me that because the city of Sacramento, which is the capital city of my State, desires an airport the State of California should build an airport in the city of Sacramento because that is the city of official business. It is no argument for national defense that this airport should be built or paid for in any way by the Government. The Government is intensely defended here in the city of Washington with its Marine airport, its Army airport, and its Navy airport. So far as that swamp land is concerned, the last time I flew to the city of Washington, the pilot refused to land in this commercial field, but did land at the Army or Navy field across the way.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Government is going to make a sufficient contribution to this airport that it should be selected at the commercial airport. There are a great many acres in this agricultural field that is spoken of, which the United States Government proposes to give. If such a plan is followed there are 14.25 acres available in the experimental farm. If the present airport is worth \$16,000 per acre, multiply this 14.25 acres by \$16,000 and this agricultural land is probably better than where the airport is at present situated. The area in Military Road amounts to 4.82 acres. The area in the lagoon amounts to 10.67 acres. The property between the lagoon and Military Road amounts to 8.10 acres. I have recited enough acreage here that on the basis of \$10,000 an acre would amount to more than \$500,000 as the contribution on the part of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, if the District of Columbia wants an airport, which it should have, the United States Government should not be made to contribute just because the Capitol is located here. There is no city from my experience and travels in the last few years during the depression that is so blessed by God as the city of Washington, D. C.; yet the folks here do not seem to know it. If they do not appreciate this fact, they better leave the District of Columbia and ride through the countryside and see the poverty and distress which exists in the country, and I am not speaking for ballyhoo purposes or for the newspapers at home when I make that statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this bill somebody, it seems to me, has received some advance information. I did not know that the commission, which this bill creates, was going to select the Washington-Hoover Field. I do not think anybody knows it and, of course, it is ridiculous to say that they do, but you continually hear this bill discussed with respect to the merits of the Washington-Hoover Airport. This is beside the question and is ridiculous. They talk about the expense to the Government in taking the Experimental Farm. There was no testimony before the subcommittee by anyone that they would take more than a small corner off of the Experimental Farm, and there was also testimony before the committee that regardless of what happened out there, the Government is now making plans to move the Experimental Farm entirely from its present location and establish it at another point.

As to whether or not Washington needs an airport for national defense, of course, Washington does not need one airport for national defense. I hope I never live to see the time when this country is engaged in war again, but if it is, and it happens that the war is brought to our shores, we will need plenty of airports for national defense purposes around the Nation's Capital. Neither 3 nor 4 nor 5 nor 6 nor 7 will be adequate. You certainly cannot concentrate your flying strength in time of war at one or two air bases. Certainly the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps bases that the gentleman has referred to, plus the present field, would not be ample for national defense purposes in time of an emergency. I say frankly to this Congress that I think before many years have gone by you will have under consideration in this House a proposition to dot several places around the Nation's Capital as auxiliary landing fields for defense purposes, as they do in nearly every other capital in the world for its adequate protection.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill, please do not be led off by the side arguments as between Gravelly Point and Washington-Hoover Field. They should not enter into the picture at all. One would think they were the only available sites in the country around the District of Columbia. Within a radius of 5 miles of the business district, the country is dotted with adequate sites on which could be placed a landing field that could be purchased right. You do not need to be scared about the \$17,400 an acre that the gentleman from Virginia talked about. There are spots all around this city, and this commission not only is directed, but is ordered to consider every available site and, as I have said, unless you can impugn the motives of this commission, you have got to assume that they will consider all the sites.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there adequate provision made to provide proper safeguards with respect to bidding and publicity in regard to all the sites submitted?

Mr. NICHOLS. No; there is not. They can select the site and then the other commission buys it. The first commission does not do anything but select the site, and the second commission buys it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the other nations of the world, many of which I have mentioned here today, through their capitals and their splendid airport facilities in practically every instance have contributed as governments to such airports at their national capitals, and here in Washington, D. C., we are face to face with the fact today that we need adequate airport facilities, and if there was ever a time when the Federal Government needed to shake hands with the District of Columbia in behalf of a project which is for the interest of both, it is now.

I may say that the Federal Government is helping cities throughout the country in the development of their airports by 30-percent grants in all the States of this Republic to assist such communities and cities in the development of proper aviation facilities.

It would be a wrong move for this House today to say to the country that this Nation has no part in the building of an adequate airport, with proper facilities, in the National Capital for the years that are ahead.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 7. In the event that the site selected by the Washington Airport Commission first provided for in this act includes in it land or property which now belongs to the Government of the United States, or any department thereof, the Commission appointed by the President is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to enter into negotiations with the department of Government having control over said property, for the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of the property, so that it may be made available for use as an airport, as provided for in this act. Any department of Government which has under its control any property necessary to the successful completion of an airport, as provided

for in this act, is hereby authorized and directed, after satisfactory negotiations have been made with the Commission, to release to said Commission as much of said property as is necessary for the successful completion of said airport.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, after the period, strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, the purpose of this amendment is to foreclose the Airport Commission from taking over other Government property, and I have particular reference to that portion of the Arlington Experimental Farm.

I want to call the attention of the committee to the language that I ask to have stricken out.

Any department of Government which has under its control any property necessary to the successful completion of an airport, as provided for in this act, is hereby authorized and directed, after satisfactory negotiations have been made with the Commission, to release to said Commission as much of said property as is necessary for the successful completion of said airport.

I think that is a very dangerous provision. It leaves the possibility there that this commission may say to the Arlington Experimental Farm that we need 50, 75, or 100 acres for an airport, and the language is such that that Department is directed, after negotiations, to turn it over to the Airport Commission.

I read a letter in the general debate on the bill from the Department of Agriculture in which they said that if they had to give up any part of the Experimental Farm adjacent to the airport that is being used for experimental purposes now it would work irreparable injury to the Agriculture Department and disrupt experiments that have been running over several years.

There are plenty of places without taking any part of that farm. Under this language, they could require also other departments of the Government to turn over land for the site of an airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from Virginia has changed his position. You remember that when the original bill was introduced the gentleman from Virginia proposed to acquire as an airport what is known as "Gravelly Point." Within Gravelly Point is land owned by the Government of the United States. If you adopt the gentleman's amendment, it would make it impossible to use any ground that now belongs to the Government.

I will say frankly that one of the finest sites, in my judgment, I saw—in my personal opinion—was a place down on Anacostia Flats, where the whole ground belongs to the Government of the United States. Why not take land that belongs to the Government and use it for an airport and save the Government from the expense of purchasing more land?

Mr. McFARLANE. Then, why not locate it on the land that belongs to the Government and stop all this poppy-cock?

Mr. NICHOLS. I stated that that was my personal opinion. We had other members on the committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time for us not to allow any small plat of ground to stand between us and the acquisition of land for an airport. I do not believe that you should adopt an amendment making it impossible to obtain any plat of ground that belongs to the Government or is held by any department of the Government. In addition to that, in nearly every site around here that is close to the District of Columbia you will find a sliver of Government land running into it, and you will have an airport commercially owned with Government land injected into it.

Mr. MILLARD. The gentleman made the statement there was a good deal of discussion that the Hoover Airport was in mind for purchase. Having section 7 in the bill, does not the gentleman feel that whoever prepared that section did have the Washington-Hoover Airport in mind?

Mr. NICHOLS. I expect I had as much to do with writing this bill as anybody. It was written by the subcommittee and it was not written by somebody and sent to us. We wrote the bill and we wrote the report. So far as I am concerned, I did not have the Hoover Airport in mind, but I did have in mind this: We saw a lot of tracts of land, some having Government land in them, and some of them are good, and we ought to fix it so that we could acquire those tracts even though some of them do belong to the Government.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman know who owns the Hoover Airport now?

Mr. NICHOLS. It is owned by a corporation; I forget the name.

Mr. MILLARD. There is nobody in the commission who has anything to do with it?

Mr. NICHOLS. No.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I believe the Hoover Airport is owned by the Government, is it not?

Mr. NICHOLS. It is not.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. If this amendment is adopted, it takes the heart out of the bill.

Mr. NICHOLS. It does not take the heart out of it. It simply forces you to trade with real-estate men instead of using some of the land belonging to the Government.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. It ought to be defeated.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. FIESINGER. Why would it not be well to except Government land where operations might be interfered with?

Mr. NICHOLS. I just stated to the gentleman that there was testimony before our subcommittee, if he is interested in protecting the Experimental Farm, that the Experimental Farm is going to be moved, and then that will be vacant land owned by the Government used for no purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum of money as may be necessary to pay the purchase price of said land and for the necessary improvements thereon: *Provided*, That said sum of money shall not be in excess of \$2,500,000. One-half of all sums expended from appropriations authorized shall be repaid to the United States, with interest at 3 percent per annum, from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia, in four equal installments, commencing 10 years after the expenditure of the money above provided for, and the said Commission shall keep strict account of all its accounts and doings, shall fix fair and uniform charges, fees, rentals, and prices for all services and privileges accorded to any person, firm, or corporation using said airport, and shall annually, in December, make report to the President of the United States, and said report shall be by the President transmitted to the Congress for its information.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 8, line 7, after the word "Treasury", insert the words "to the credit of the District of Columbia", and in line 11, after the figures "\$2,500,000", strike out the period, insert a colon, and strike out all of the balance of line 11 and all of lines 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and the words "provided for" in line 17.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in no way interferes with the attempt on the part of the committee to furnish the District of Columbia with a proper airport. It does not change any of their provisions in the bill at all, except that instead of having the Government pay all the money and then waiting 10 years to eventually have a chance of getting half of it back, it provides that the District of Columbia shall do just like the people do back in Tennessee and West Virginia and Texas and Oklahoma—namely, pay for their own airport. What is wrong with that? Is there anything about the District of Columbia that makes its people here sacred, that we have to make them holy, as my friend from South Carolina, Mr. McMILLAN, suggests? Why give them everything on God's earth free?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. The gentleman's amendment still leaves that portion of the bill permitting the Government to turn over land.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it leaves every provision in the bill, but provides that the District shall pay for its airport. Why should you not support this amendment? Are your people back home satisfied with the present system of taxation whereby they pay for everything at home and then pay a great big sum here on civic expenses?

Mr. McMILLAN. May I say to the Members of the House that the record shows that \$300,000,000 have been expended by municipalities in this country for airports. I do not see why Washington should be excepted.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. And there are not going to be any returns from this airport. So far as the splendid airport that we have in my city is concerned, the taxpayers have to dig down and make up the deficit. My home people paid for it and pay all maintenance charges and are glad to do it. We want airplanes to stop there. We have regular daily airplane mail service there. Do you want to have the Government put up all this money? That is what the Government is doing under this bill. This Government is putting up every dollar of it, \$2,500,000 and then it will wait 10 years and get a part of it back on the installment plan.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Do they do that in Graham?

Mr. McFARLANE. No; we had to pay for our own airport. Under the loan and grant of the P. W. A. money the Government grants only 30 percent and the people have to pay 70 percent. Yet here for the city of Washington, under this bill they will receive a 100-percent grant from the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. The District has had its share of the P. W. A. money. It got about \$1,700,000 to put in a sewer system and it got a lot of money from the Government to build a splendid tuberculosis hospital, which is being done at the present time.

It has gotten its share of the relief money. This Government spent \$11,000,000 here in Washington last year for relief, out of the Public Treasury, and it has not got a dollar of it back. It spent about \$1,000,000 a month for relief. If you will check up on the P. W. A. fund and every other fund you will see that Washington has gotten its lion's share of it. It gets the lion's share of all the jobs in Washington. It has gotten many times as many jobs as Texas, a great commonwealth, 900 miles across east and west and 900 miles across north and south. Texas gets a mere hand-out on public jobs compared to Washington. If you will go around Washington you will see "P. W. A. Project No. So-and-so." Go right down the Avenue and look on the left and you will see "P. W. A. Project No. So-and-so." There are hundreds of thousands of dollars spent here in various parts of the city annually out of various bills, no part of which is paid by the District of Columbia. Are you not getting tired of it? What reason is there for it? They are not overtaxed. I will say to my good friend from Oklahoma, Mr. NICHOLS—and I think he is one of the most valuable young Members of this House—I am going to put in here what his people down in Oklahoma spend compared to what the people spend here in Washington for taxes. It is time to stop it. I hope you will vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. There is also authorized to be appropriated annually, so much as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the airport, including compensation of employees, repairs and accessories, purchase or installation, and maintenance of supplies

and materials. One-half of said appropriations to be charged to the District of Columbia; one-half of all moneys received from the operation of said airport shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; and one-half credited to the treasury of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this section should go out of the bill because of the amendment we have just adopted. I offer an amendment to strike out section 9.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Beginning on page 9, line 1, strike out all of section 9.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet seeking recognition when the Chairman put the motion on the previous amendment. I wanted to be heard on the amendment, opposing the amendment, as a member of the committee. I was on my feet seeking recognition when the Chair put the question. I am not sure what the parliamentary procedure is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman rise or hear him ask for recognition.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I also was seeking recognition at the same time, and I saw the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] on his feet and asking for recognition.

Mr. McFARLANE. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma to ask unanimous consent to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. But, Mr. Chairman, we have voted on that and determined it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, the gentleman from Texas will object to it, I expect, if I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman had risen to question the vote, I would not have objected.

Mr. NICHOLS. I was on my feet. I did rise.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean before the Chair announced the vote.

Mr. DUNN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] was adopted be reconsidered and that I be recognized in opposition to the amendment before it is voted upon again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. NICHOLS. May we again have the amendment reported?

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Beginning on page 9, line 1, strike out all of section 9.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. It relates to how this money shall be paid back. We have already provided that the District shall pay it, so there is no use having this last section. It does not injure the bill at all.

Mr. NICHOLS. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am sure the gentleman is in perfect good faith in his zeal to save money for the taxpayers of Texas and Oklahoma and the other States, but in this instance the gentleman is wrong. If you are going to force the District of Columbia to pay all the bill—and I do not think you can force them to do so, but if you can do so—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the first part of section 9 should be retained, so I withdraw the amendment; and then I will offer another.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that portion of section 9 beginning in line 5 on page 9 with the word "one-half" and the balance of the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 9, line 5, after the word "materials", beginning with the word "one-half", strike out the remainder of the section.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in writing.

Mr. BLANTON. This is not a technical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask permission to put it in writing.

Mr. NICHOLS. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer the amendment.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE] is recognized.

Mr. McFARLANE. Speaking to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], it would be foolish to refuse to adopt this amendment, in view of the fact that we have already adopted an amendment requiring the District of Columbia to pay for this airport, just as every other city in the United States pays for its airport if they have one.

If you dance you must pay the fiddler. We know that the District of Columbia is receiving more aid now per capita than any other city in the United States its size.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman explain whether or not this body by legislation can force the District of Columbia to spend money on an airport if the Commissioners of the District of Columbia do not want to spend the money?

Mr. McFARLANE. No; but it might stop this committee from bringing in this kind of legislation if we hang this kind of amendment on it.

Mr. NICHOLS. It will stop the District of Columbia from getting an airport.

Mr. McFARLANE. That is what we want to do, that is what I want to do. In other words, if the District of Columbia wants an airport let them get it the same way every other city gets an airport; let them buy it and pay for it.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. I am not expressing any opinion on this point but the gentleman's city, for instance, has the right to fix its own tax rate. The gentleman's city can borrow money and issue bonds, it has the benefit of inheritance taxes and income taxes, for most States have income tax laws. Not so with the District of Columbia, however, for this body, this Congress, controls the revenue of the District of Columbia absolutely. They are supine, they cannot do anything without our consent, yet we will not let them levy taxes although we hold them responsible for not doing things. What is the gentleman's comment on this situation?

Mr. McFARLANE. Answering the gentleman I will say that the bill which authorizes them to build the airport gives them full powers to build it if they see fit.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the tax rate per \$100 or per \$1,000 paid on real property in the District of Columbia?

Mr. McFARLANE. I think it is a dollar and a quarter or a dollar and a half.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the assessed valuation or on the actual valuation?

Mr. McFARLANE. It is supposed to be on actual valuation, although they reduce it about half.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Therefore it would be about \$15 per \$1,000. I pay \$45 per \$1,000 on actual valuation.

Mr. McFARLANE. That is true; and we all know that the tax rate here in the District is lower than the tax rate in any other city of comparable size in the United States. There is no argument about that, we know it is true.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman said the rate was \$1.50 a thousand.

Mr. McFARLANE. No; it is \$1.50 per hundred, \$15 per thousand. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] whether or not I am correct?

Mr. BLANTON. It is \$1.50 per hundred, or \$15 per thousand, on far less than actual valuation, as compared with \$45 per \$1,000 the gentleman from Michigan pays there on full valuation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 9, line 5, after the word "materials", strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert the following:

"Sec. 9. There is also authorized to be appropriated annually from the revenues of the District of Columbia so much money as may be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the airport, including compensation of employees, repairs, and accessories, purchase or installation, and maintenance of supplies and materials."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, adopting the amendment leaves the bill exactly as it was except that instead of the people back home having to pay all this money which the bill originally provided, and then waiting 10 years to get half of it back, the District of Columbia pays for its own airport. This is the way it ought to be.

The provision my amendment seeks to strike out provided that one-half of the profit was to be paid the Government. Of course, we know there will be no profit, so it ought to be stricken out.

Now, let me say to my friend about taxes, that the tax rate here now is \$1.50 a hundred not on full valuation, because if you will read the hearings on the last District appropriation bill you will see that the Commissioners testified that year before last they arbitrarily reduced the tax assessment here by \$80,000,000 at one time, just arbitrarily reduced the assessed valuation by \$80,000,000. You will see that last year they made another reduction in valuation of \$50,000,000. So last year and the year before the District Commissioners reduced the assessed valuation \$130,000,000, and still the tax rate is only \$1.50 a hundred, or \$15 a thousand. My friend from Michigan says the tax rate in his district is \$45 a thousand. Do you know what the tax rate is in some of the large cities of Oklahoma, where our friend JACK NICHOLS lives? Down there some pay \$6 on the hundred, or about \$60 on the \$1,000.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman know of any municipality in the country where the tax rate is so low?

Mr. BLANTON. There is not one so low as Washington. The people of the District of Columbia pay a lower rate of tax than prevails in any other city of comparable size in the United States.

Mr. MILLARD. Or of any size.

Mr. BLANTON. If you doubt that, check it up. I want to repeat what I said before: Ben Johnson, of Kentucky, a splendid man, who used to be chairman of this committee, once spent 12 months intensely investigating this tax rate in Washington. I will guarantee that every Member of Congress who will read his last report will be astounded at the hundreds of millions of dollars our Government has spent here benefiting Washington people.

We are leaving this bill just as the committee framed it, except as to who is to pay for it. Every provision they wanted in the bill is still there. We have not disturbed a provision except one, and that is we are keeping the Government from paying all of this money and getting half of it back some of these days.

We are letting the District do what we do back home; that is, pay for their own airport. Out in California, they have spent millions of dollars out there for airports, just like we have in Texas, and we have some of the finest in the world down there in Texas. At Fort Worth, Dallas, Abilene, El Paso, and San Antonio we have splendid air-

ports. The Government has two here in Washington, one for the Army and one for the Navy. They say you can take a bucket of water and stick an airplane—

Mr. NICHOLS. I am talking about the Army airport down here.

Mr. BLANTON. We have an Army airport and a Navy airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. That is the one I was talking about sticking with a bucket of water.

Mr. BLANTON. We have an Army and a Navy airport. If they are not good enough we will build better ones. But when we pay for them, we want to own them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if those who are opposing this bill, and who know that the airport will not be built unless Government funds are provided, have ever thought about this feature: That sometime today or tomorrow or some other time one of our colleagues may land in this field and a fatality occur? If such would happen we will be holding memorial service for those Members next year.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is not only a crying shame but an absolute disgrace to the Nation that Washington has not one of the model airports of the world. It is a tribute to the pilots who have been flying the commercial planes to Washington that there have not been tragedies so far. They are doing the best they can with the facilities available. But think of it, Washington of all cities, the finest, most beautiful capital in the world, has one of the worst airports in the country.

We know that the District of Columbia is not going to build an airport, at least not in its initial stage. It has to have help from the Federal Government. Right in the middle of the present airport, which is privately owned, you have a road, and a very much used road. The airport is not usable unless the planes cross that road. There is a stop and go sign there. Can you imagine an airplane stopping in the middle of the air because the sign is red? Not until we invent some air hooks with which to hang them onto the clouds can you do that. We have heard of a number of cases throughout the country of airplanes striking automobiles, killing the people in the automobiles and the plane. Washington is the heart of this country. Do we want that to happen here? Along with our other great transportation systems the air has become very important, and because of the nature of governmental affairs today, it becomes increasingly necessary for people to come to Washington by plane. We have a great increase in our air traffic, yet have provided no facilities. Talk about the Army and Navy field? May I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that the present Army and Navy fields are two of the worst fields in the world.

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman. But let us remedy them. But this bill will not remedy them.

Mr. MAAS. That is what we want to do, and we want to remedy the commercial field as well.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. We can raise the local tax rate here in Washington 10 cents and have more than enough money to buy and build the field. Just raise the tax rate from \$1.50 to \$1.60. I will go along with the gentleman then and help build the finest army field and the finest navy field in the world, because the gentleman says we need them, and I have confidence in the gentleman's judgment on such matters. He is one of our finest flyers, but he is not helping the situation by building a local city field here for the District with Government money, and which will charge the Government for every plane that lands on the field. He is not helping that situation.

Mr. MAAS. We have to have a commercial field. The District of Columbia is not going to build a field at the present time. We have not raised the tax rate, and I do not

know that we would be justified in raising it. All I am pleading for is an airport.

Mr. BLANTON. The Commissioners may enter an order tomorrow increasing the tax rate 10 cents.

Mr. MAAS. But they have not done it.

Mr. BLANTON. An act of Congress is not necessary to do that.

Mr. MAAS. But in the meantime there is not a satisfactory airport here.

Mr. Chairman, if people are killed on that field it is our responsibility. The matter is in our hands; nobody else's. I shall hold this House responsible if any deaths result from our failure to provide an adequate field. The gentleman from Texas knows a great deal more than I do about the modus operandi; but I appeal to the House for a satisfactory airport. I do not care what the technicalities are, but I warn you that you are doing a great injustice to the country and to the people who have to come to Washington by air, if a decent airport is not provided.

The Washington-Hoover site offers a very fine opportunity, together with the agricultural farm, if Military Road is closed. Combining those three fields together would give us one of the finest airports in the country and one of the rare instances of having a field so close to the city, which is a big advantage to passengers.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I will go with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] before the Navy Committee or the Army Committee and help build one of the finest fields in the world for this Government, one for the Army and one for the Navy; but we are not getting anywhere with this kind of a bill. This is not a Government bill at all; it is simply a local city bill, but the Government is to pay for it.

Mr. NICHOLS. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that that will not help the commercial situation, and that is where the trouble lies.

Mr. MAAS. That is exactly the point I am making. We need a commercial airport for the city of Washington, entirely aside from the Army and Navy needs, which have no relationship to the commercial needs. I am concerned with the practical and not theoretical situation involved in getting an adequate airport for Washington immediately.

It is not the people of Washington who are so much concerned with the providing of an airport here. It is really a national problem. It is used mostly by people coming here on Government business. Since it is the Nation's Capital, and air transportation here is largely for the convenience of the Nation's citizens, the Federal Government should bear part of the expense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote down this amendment, and I will tell you why. Of course, if the former amendment of the gentleman from Texas is to remain in the bill, this amendment, probably, should follow; but this can be taken care of even if we leave the language in the bill, because there will be a separate vote demanded on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] when we go back into the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is what we have done. If there are any among you who appreciate the trying necessity for an adequate airport at Washington and if you are friendly to the proposition that Washington should have an adequate airport, you have defeated your purpose by the adoption of the Blanton amendment, and I will tell you why: We cannot force the District of Columbia to spend any sum of money to build an airport. We can simply make provision for it, but we cannot force them, and if we leave this amendment in the bill, the District of Columbia will not build the airport, and the matter will stay where it is now, with two little plots of ground cut in two by Military Road, where Eddie Rickenbacker testified before our com-

mittee that every time an airplane sat down over that Military Road it endangered the lives of not only the passengers on the ship but the lives of pedestrians along the road.

If you put this provision back in the bill, TOM BLANTON need not be so exercised about the Government's spending 50 percent of the cost and the maintenance of this airport. This Government, under this administration, has gone up and down the length and breadth of the United States granting 30 percent here and 30 percent there to every little town of 3,500 people that would build an airport out of a little pasture field.

Why should the city of Washington be condemned? I have no fight to make for their taxation system. I do not think the citizens here pay enough taxes, but let us not wreak our vengeance out on this piece of legislation. If you leave this amendment in the bill, you will fix it so that the Capital of your Nation cannot have an adequate airport, although, as a nation, we boast of leading the march of progress of the nations of the world, and yet we have an air field out here that looks like a cracker box and is almost as hard to get into.

If you are interested in this bill, I may say the bill will do you no good unless you vote with the committee when we ask a separate vote on the adoption of the Blanton amendment.

I also hope you will kill the amendment now under consideration and then vote for the committee to take out the Blanton amendment when we get back into the House.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if Military Road that passes alongside of the present commercial airport is endangering the lives of some of our constituents who visit here in Washington, why is it that the committee cannot bring in a bill authorizing condemnation proceedings and condemn this road? I am willing to abandon this road and give it to the airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is the gentleman willing for me to answer that question?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. The road is absolutely under the control of the War Department and they have refused to close the road. There is now a resolution pending before our committee, which we are attempting to report out, to force the closing of the road and we are getting plenty of opposition from Virginia to the closing of this road.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I will vote for such a bill, and that is our duty.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. My amendment has nothing to do with Military Road. My amendment simply has to do with relieving the Government of paying all this money. If you pass my amendment, Military Road can still be taken care of under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. If the gentleman will leave me 1 minute of my time, let me say that the ninth section of this bill is more abhorrent to me than the donation of the money to build this airport. I would rather give \$2,000,000 to build the airport than to have this recurring, annual expense which is more abhorrent to me than anything else.

Mr. NICHOLS. We have got to maintain it.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Let the District of Columbia maintain it.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he has proposed this amendment as an economical measure in behalf of the Treasury?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it keeps the Government from paying \$2,500,000 now and waiting 10 years to get half of it back. That is an economy, is it not?

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, if economy is the issue, which prompts our concern over such a comparatively small item, it appears that it is a type of economy which "strains at gnats and swallows camels." I sat on the floor here a year ago when we harangued all the afternoon over a matter

of \$100,000 for the Chicago fair. A day or two after this we came in, closed our eyes, and, without debate and under a strict gag, voted \$1,272,000,000 to hand over to the President, without restriction or designation as to how he might spend this huge amount.

In the last session we voted a substantial subsidy to the bankers of America through the enactment of the Federal Housing Act. Under this bill, which the Congress meekly enacted, bankers receive 9.72-percent interest for loans which they make on the renovation of homes, and on mortgage loans which they make, to be repaid over a period of 20 years, they further gouge the public up to as high as 13 percent.

In addition, we take John Taxpayer's money and guarantee the banker up to 20 percent of any loss incurred on these loans, notwithstanding the usurious rates which they are exacting. Not only are we doing this for the bankers but we are spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, employing thousands of individuals in the F. E. R. A. to canvass the homes of America asking the citizens to borrow money from the bankers for renovation or new construction at these extortionate rates. The Federal Housing ballyhoo has invaded every section of the country at great expense to the taxpayers. They have had 29 national radio hook-up ballyhoos in an endeavor to lead the people to the doors of the private bankers to borrow money, where the lowest interest rate is 9.72 percent. Instead of driving the money changers out of the temple, as we were promised by the President in his inaugural address, we are paying millions of the taxpayers' money to bring the distressed home owner to the threshold of the banker to be bled white. This is indeed a new deal for the banker. Never before did he have the Government cooperating with him in the exaction of usury.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPEL. In a moment, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed. And after these people have borrowed this money, having 20 years to repay it, they will virtually pay for two or three houses while they actually own one. The Congress condones this and yet we quibble over a little matter of one and a half million dollars for a necessary airport which will contribute to commercial progress and which may be utilized also from the standpoint of defense!

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman tell us who was the father of Zebedee's children? That is just as apropos to the bill now before us, which is to relieve officials from giving bonds.

Mr. HOEPEL. I am not discussing ancient history but the inconsistency of our present situation and the utter absurdity, in the light of our past actions, of injecting the question of economy into the discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPEL. For a question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to say that regardless of the talk here about the responsibility of the District of Columbia and the Federal Government being involved in the expenditure for an airport, we cannot get away from the proposition, that down in our hearts this will be a truly national utility.

Mr. HOEPEL. I concur in the views of the gentleman. I want to emphasize further the fact that we are quibbling about small things which would be in the public interest and doing much for the financial group. In my opinion, we are not living up to our obligations as legislators. Speaking editorially this morning, the Washington Herald states:

There was a time when Congress possessed the intelligence to meet great crises and, in proper cooperation with the other two coordinate branches of the Government, solve them in statesmanlike fashion.

There was a time when the Congress was composed of self-respecting American citizens.

That time has passed.

The Congress of the United States has earned the contempt of the Nation.

I do not agree with the Herald wherein it is implied that Congress is not composed of self-respecting American citizens. This Seventy-fourth Congress, in my opinion, represents the finest and highest type of American citizenship and intelligence, but I must confess that thus far we have failed

to exercise the intelligence which God has given us and we have not faced the issue courageously in the degree which I consider necessary in our present crisis.

As Representatives I believe that we are beginning to wake up to our responsibilities, and I do hope that the criticism which has been directed at our body by the Hearst newspapers may serve to spur us on to act according to the dictates of our own consciences and understanding, and to decide for ourselves the merit of the questions submitted to us by the synthetic economists and Wall Street agents who apparently hold the reins here in the various departments.

I am still hopeful that the Congress of the United States, giving heed to the principles expressed in the President's inaugural address, will do everything possible to drive the money changers out of the temple and to restore to the Congress the right which is vouchsafed to it in the Constitution "to coin money and regulate the value thereof", rather than to permit this function to be usurped by the private international banker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. Norton) there were 58 ayes and 37 noes.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3806) to establish a commercial airport in the District of Columbia, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What is the vote on, the Blanton amendment or the committee amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that there is only one amendment and that is the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. There is only one amendment and that is the committee amendment. The question is on the committee amendment as a substitute.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, what is the amendment we are voting on?

The SPEAKER. It is on the committee amendment as a substitute to the bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does the substitute include the Blanton amendment?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And we cannot vote separately on the Blanton amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. There is but one amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects on the ground that there is no quorum present. Evidently there

is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 20, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—316

Amle	Eckert	Knutson	Ramsay
Arnold	Edmiston	Kocalkowski	Ramspeck
Ashbrook	Eicher	Kopplemann	Randolph
Ayers	Ekwall	Kramer	Rankin
Bacharach	Ellenbogen	Lambertson	Ransley
Barden	Engel	Lambeth	Rayburn
Beiter	Englebright	Lanham	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Faddis	Lea, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Biermann	Farley	Lehlbach	Relly
Binderup	Fenerty	Lemke	Richards
Blackney	Ferguson	Lesinski	Richardson
Blanton	Fernandez	Lewis, Colo.	Robison, Ky.
Bloom	Fiesinger	Lloyd	Rogers, Mass.
Boehne	Fish	Lord	Rogers, Okla.
Bolleau	Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Romjue
Boland	Fletcher	Luckey	Rudd
Bolton	Focht	Ludlow	Sabath
Boylan	Ford, Calif.	Lundeen	Sadowski
Brennan	Ford, Miss.	McAndrews	Sandlin
Brown, Ga.	Fuller	McCormack	Sauthoff
Brown, Mich.	Fulmer	McFarlane	Schaefer
Brunner	Gasque	McGehee	Schnelder
Buck	Gassaway	McGrath	Schuetz
Buckbee	Gavagan	McGroarty	Schulte
Buckler, Minn.	Gearhart	McKeough	Scott
Burdick	Gehrmann	McLaughlin	Scrugham
Cannon, Mo.	Gildea	McLean	Shanley
Cannon, Wis.	Gillette	McLeod	Sirovich
Carlson	Gingery	McMillan	Smith, Wash.
Carmichael	Goldsborough	McReynolds	Snell
Carpenter	Gray, Ind.	McSwain	Somers, N. Y.
Cartwright	Green	Maas	Spence
Cary	Greenway	Mahon	Stack
Casey	Greenwood	Maloney	Starnes
Castellow	Greever	Mansfield	Stefan
Chapman	Gregory	Mapes	Stewart
Christianson	Griswold	Marcantonio	Stubbs
Church	Guyer	Martin, Mass.	Sullivan
Citron	Gwynne	Mason	Sutphin
Claiborne	Halleck	Massingale	Sweeney
Colden	Hancock, N. Y.	Maverick	Tarver
Cole, N. Y.	Harlan	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Collins	Harter	Meeks	Taylor, S. C.
Colmer	Hess	Merritt, Conn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooley	Higgins, Conn.	Merritt, N. Y.	Terry
Cooper, Tenn.	Higgins, Mass.	Michener	Thom
Costello	Hildebrandt	Millard	Thomason
Cox	Hill, Ala.	Mitchell, Ill.	Thurston
Cravens	Hill, Knute	Mitchell, Tenn.	Tinkham
Crawford	Hill, Samuel B.	Monaghan	Tolan
Crosby	Hobbs	Moran	Tonry
Crosser, Ohio	Hoepfel	Mott	Truax
Crowe	Hoffman	Nelson	Turner
Cullen	Holmes	Nichols	Turpin
Cummings	Hook	Norton	Utterback
Daly	Hope	O'Brien	Vinson, Ga.
Darrow	Houston	O'Connell	Vinson, Ky.
Deen	Huddleston	O'Connor	Wadsworth
Delaney	Hull	O'Day	Wallgren
Dempsey	Imhoff	O'Leary	Walter
Dies	Jacobsen	O'Neal	Wearin
Dietrich	Jenckes, Ind.	Owen	Weaver
Dingell	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano	Welch
Disney	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Werner
Ditter	Johnson, W. Va.	Parsons	West
Dobbins	Jones	Patman	Whelchel
Dockweiler	Kahn	Patterson	White
Dondoro	Kee	Patton	Whittington
Dorsey	Keller	Pearson	Wilcox
Doughton	Kelly	Perkins	Williams
Doxey	Kennedy, Md.	Peterson, Fla.	Wilson, La.
Driscoll	Kennedy, N. Y.	Peterson, Ga.	Withrow
Driver	Kenney	Pettengill	Wolcott
Duffey, Ohio	Kerr	Pfeifer	Wolfenden
Duffy, N. Y.	Kimball	Pierce	Wolverton
Duncan	Kinzer	Plumley	Wood
Dunn, Miss.	Kleberg	Powers	Young
Dunn, Pa.	Kloeb	Quinn	Zimmerman
Eagle	Kniffin	Rabaut	Zioncheck

NAYS—20

Allen	Burnham	Montague	Smith, Va.
Arends	Darden	Pittenger	Steagall
Berlin	Drewry	Robertson	Umstead
Bland	Gilchrist	Secret	Warren
Burch	Kvale	Sisson	Woodrum

NOT VOTING—93

Adair	Brewster	Cavicchia	Cole, Md.
Andresen	Brooks	Celler	Connery
Andrew, Mass.	Buchanan	Chandler	Cooper, Ohio
Andrews, N. Y.	Buckley, N. Y.	Clark, Idaho	Corning
Bacon	Bulwinkle	Clark, N. C.	Cross, Tex.
Bankhead	Caldwell	Cochran	Crowther
Beam	Carter	Coffee	Culkin

Dear	Hart	Murdock	Smith, Conn.
DeRouen	Hartley	Oliver	Smith, W. Va.
Dickstein	Healey	O'Malley	Snyder
Dirksen	Hennings	Peyser	South
Doutrich	Hollister	Polk	Summers, Tex.
Eaton	Jenkins, Ohio	Reece	Taber
Evans	Lamneck	Rich	Thomas
Flannagan	Larrabee	Robinson, Utah	Thompson
Frey	Lee, Okla.	Rogers, N. H.	Tobey
Gambrill	Lewis, Md.	Russell	Treadway
Gifford	McClellan	Ryan	Underwood
Goodwin	Marshall	Sanders, La.	Wigglesworth
Granfield	Martin, Colo.	Sanders, Tex.	Wilson, Pa.
Gray, Pa.	May	Sears	Woodruff
Haines	Miller	Seger	
Hamlin	Montet	Shannon	
Hancock, N. C.	Moritz	Short	

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Connery with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Granfield with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Taber.
 Mr. Sears with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Oliver with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. May with Mr. Goodwin.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. Corning with Mr. Bacon.
 Mr. Martin of Colorado with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Hollister.
 Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Brewster.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Marshall.
 Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Andresen.
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Tobey.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. Wigglesworth.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Reece.
 Mr. Sanders of Texas with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Cavicchia.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Haines with Mr. Andrews of New York.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Thomas.
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. Cross of Texas with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Russell.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. McClellan.
 Mr. Moritz with Mr. Polk.
 Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Murdock.
 Mr. O'Malley with Mr. Smith of Connecticut.
 Mr. Snyder with Mr. Thompson.
 Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. South.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hamlin.
 Mr. Evans with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Hennings with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Healey with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Caldwell with Mr. Coffee.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Chandler.
 Mr. Clark of Idaho with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. WOODRUM changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs upon the engrossment and third reading of the bill, as amended.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BUNKER HILL ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley on the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address made by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Bunker Hill Council, No. 62, Knights of Columbus, at Charlestown, Mass., in celebration of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, on Sunday evening, June 16, 1935.

I feel particularly honored that you in Boston have invited me—an outlander, so far as New England is concerned—to address you on this occasion. I have always believed that the anniversary we are celebrating commemorates about the most significant day in our whole history. Yes; I am not even excepting the Fourth

of July, for, if I read history correctly, it is very doubtful if there would have been any Fourth of July for this country had it not been for the great happenings on Bunker Hill 160 years ago.

I suppose some of our accurate historians will complain that I do not say Breeds Hill. This is no time for controversy and it is Bunker Hill in every American mind. Tomorrow is Bunker Hill day, regardless of where the fiercest fighting raged when the medley of American soldiers hurled back the onslaught of the British veterans of Minden. The Yankees had neither a supreme commander, nor a national government. They fought under their State commanders, and while the book men are still figuring whether Massachusetts, Connecticut, or New Hampshire supplied the greatest leader, all the country cares about is that the combined effort of that day taught the world that a new Nation was being born.

Up to that time it was the popular impression through Europe that England was combating merely a frontier revolt by an unorganized group over which the British regulars would ride roughshod whenever they pleased. Bunker Hill conveyed to the world that a new principle, the principle of self-government, was being born, and that the whole population of the American Colonies was willing to fight, and if need be die, to establish independence. It took 7 years of hardship and struggle and bloodshed to convince Great Britain that she had lost her Colonies and even then the lesson was not complete, for 20 years later she tested American sentiment again, with the same result.

But why should I attempt to review the history to which you live next door, and of the details of which you are infinitely better informed, and of the importance of which no words of mine can add to your appreciation.

We in this country are not given much to worship at historical shrines, but Bunker Hill monument stands as the more familiar token of our national achievements than any other. Greater battles have been fought, more decisive determinations of important issues have been reached, higher monuments have been built; but from one end of the country to the other—in sentiment—your monument overtops all that have been raised to commemorate the achievements of our country.

Perhaps the example of those New Englanders that showed the world years ago the depth and courage and resource of America, performed a service as great or greater than the immediate encouragement of the Republic by leaving to their descendants, and to those who gathered about their descendants to form your great communities of today, a heritage of duty. Perhaps it was because of them that you have preserved this spirit, that you have ever since been in the forefront of every movement to resist tyranny and to correct the errors and abuses which new conditions brought in their train.

We, who are connected with the administration in Washington, will never forget that it was Massachusetts that blazed the way for New England's getting into the movement to rid this country of the domination of a group that held our people shackled. The group which, because of the blindness of their reactionism, helped us to drift into an abject depression—a group whose leadership, or lack of leadership, sunk the richest Nation in the world into a condition where the Government had to step in with doles to save millions of our people from actual starvation.

It was Massachusetts that revolted against religious intolerance and prohibition fanaticism when it stood forth and voted for liberalism in 1928. In 1932, New England, despite its tradition of conservative solidarity, followed the Bay State in demanding a new deal for America; followed the leader who is now in the White House, and has sustained him ever since. It has sustained him not because of any political strategy or trickery. It is because it recognized in him a determination to give this country prosperity and contentment if it were humanly possible to do this through acts of government. You New England men and women have been faithful to the old tradition. The courage of your ancestors at the birth of the Nation is still with you. Our country realizes that whenever the occasion arises for a patriotic decision it may be sure that you will be found steadfast in the faith. It is in your blood to be true to what your conscience tells you is right.

I am afraid that in my bringing together the memory of the clear-minded men who fought for a new thing 160 years ago and the equally clear-minded men and women of 1935 that I will be accused of injecting politics into a historic occasion. This is far from my purpose. Actually, politics has nothing to do with the efforts to combat depression, threatened starvation, and economic confusion. It would be a vain glorification of my own party to assume that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was put into the White House by Democrats alone, or that the measures he has taken and the results he has accomplished in getting our country out of the mire have been reached through the exclusive efforts of any partisan group. The only political aspect of it is because it suits the purposes and perhaps the necessities of certain men and aggregations of men to make it appear that recovery is anything but the concern of the whole people. The issue of today is bigger than the question of what party has title to Government offices.

I dare say there never was a time in our history when politics did not come into the picture of every important controversy. Even in the days when the British held Boston, and the American forces besieged them, there were those who thought the revolt of the Colonies was a mistake. Time has brought us to that state of tolerance where we may admit that even some of the Tories of those days may have been sincere in their opposition to breaking

the ties with the mother country, but nobody will assume that their sincerity atoned for the sin against their country, once the Colonies had embarked on the great enterprise of freedom.

I cite this extreme example of tolerance to illustrate what is perhaps the finest of all our American characteristics, that in themselves are a consequence of the Revolution ushered in by the battle we are commemorating. Before that struggle the rivalry, amounting almost to enmity comparable to the jealousies of the old Balkan States in some instances, was a prevailing element among the Dominion States. Indeed, it was the thought that their divergent interests and conflicting views would make it impossible for them to take united action against England, and therefore Great Britain reasoned that the task of crushing them would not be difficult. On the contrary, the common cause brought the Colonies into accord—they forgot their prejudices, they sank their aversions, they left their mutual differences to future adjustment, and when the new country swung into general action, Yankee fishermen and tobacco plantation folks, eastern capitalists and western frontiersmen—in fact, people of every creed, from every section fought side by side. They had learned the great lesson that no class, no group has a monopoly of goodness, any more than that some other element of our population has a monopoly of evil.

Perhaps some of my hearers may be inclined to doubt this in political campaign periods, when the violence of partisanship spurs orators to make charges and accusations against the opposition so monstrous that if anyone took them seriously, he would stand aghast at so much villainy. If the opponents of my party believed what they say about us they would not speak to me on the street. And if we on our side arraigned the entire membership of the opposition in similar fashion treason would be the least of the crimes we would prosecute them for. In fact our political campaigns are a sort of truce of tolerance, but when it is over we settle down to our humdrum existence and find that we get along perfectly in every relation of life with each other.

Such a spirit is indeed a worth-while heritage from our struggle for independence, of which this sacred shaft commemorates the beginning. For civil war we have substituted our every 4 years' spasm, and so we have grown and prospered through a century and a half, and 30 or 40 administrations, with a minimum of strife and a maximum of orderly progress. We have not only furnished a pattern of Government that has been followed by nations all over the world, but by the example of our national system we have taught the world that wrongs may be righted and rulers may be changed without fury or civil war.

I realize that in this city have stood the greatest orators our Nation has produced, and each in turn has delivered his message of congratulation to his audience and reverence to the towering figures of our history. I cannot hope to approach the magnificence of their eloquence and I am humbly sensible of the compliment you pay me in listening to the words of a plain American citizen.

We have had many stresses in our national life, and we are but emerging from perhaps the most dangerous crisis of them all. It must be the hope of every one of us that our emergence from the dark situation will not be checked, either by those who would overturn the fabric of our economic welfare, with wild schemes of confiscation of wealth, or those whose crusted reactionism makes them hang back from every movement that seeks to have Government keep pace with progress.

The founding fathers of our country started us off with magnificent equipment for the Nation's long journey. They told us the road would be beset with dangers and pitfalls; they pointed the direction we must take to reach our goal—farther than that they could not go. They could give us no map nor chart for the future beyond the period of their own lives, for it does not lie with any human being to foretell what lies far ahead in an ever-changing world. Every generation must meet its own problems, and hew its own trail when it finds itself beyond the zone of signposts and known landmarks. In such times—and the present is such a time—unity of purpose and faith in our leaders is our only hope. There is no backward path in the eternal journey of civilization. The world in the past has at times sought safety in retreat, and has landed in chaos that endured for centuries. We must go on.

Let me close this brief recital of the thoughts of a simple citizen with words spoken by one whose voice will ever resound down the ages. More than a century ago, Daniel Webster at the laying of the cornerstone of Bunker Hill Monument told the whole story when he said:

"Our proper business is improvement. Let our age be the age of improvement. In a day of peace, let us advance the arts of peace and the works of peace. Let us develop the resources of the land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered. Let us cultivate a true spirit of union and harmony. In pursuing the great objects which our condition points out to us, let us act under a settled conviction and an habitual feeling that these 24 States are one country."

These 24 States he spoke of then are now 48 States; the country of which he spoke ended in the wilderness of what is now Ohio, but his thought is as true today as it was in 1825.

He concluded with these words, which constitutes a perfect code for all Americans:

"Let our object be, our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country. And, by the blessing of God, may that

country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration for ever!"

ALLOTMENT OF TRIBAL FUNDS OF COEUR D'ALENE INDIANS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the Indians of this country there are many problems arising out of the agreements that have been made with the Indians in treaties that have been ratified in the past. History reveals that the Indians of my State of Idaho have been peaceful and have faithfully kept the promises made in the execution of the treaties that have been made by the Government in dealing with their problems. That the Members of the House may have the views of a member of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Indians I insert herewith a copy of a letter from Philip Wildshoe, an allottee on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation.

DE SMET MISSION, IDAHO, May 16, 1935.

HON. COMPTON J. WHITE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received the Union Calendar No. 61, H. R. 6223, Report No. 249, which you have mailed to me. I am very pleased to receive said bill.

I will explain to you truly, as I am strongly against the use of the Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money, money arising from surplus Coeur d'Alene Indian land sales or Coeur d'Alene Indian funds held by the United States in trust for the respective tribe of Coeur d'Alene Indian wrongly expending on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency administrations to no benefit, creating nothing.

Mr. WHITE, I will give you the clear history of the Government agent and other employees, which is in my knowledge by me, seeing with my own eyes and knew what was going on amongst the Government agent and other employees on the post, operating on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation in Idaho.

Back in the year of 1897, the Coeur d'Alene Indians had no doctor, no medicine; because Coeur d'Alene Indians had no money at that time that would be held by the United States in trust for Coeur d'Alene Indians.

In the year 1909, when the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation was thrown open by action of Congress United States Government. Surplus Coeur d'Alene Indian land sold to homesteaders this accumulate some money Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money. First Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency was established build by Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money, was under guise as said agency was built by United States Government expenses; not true. Second, said Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration's appointment of superfluous of employees, at extravagant expenditures on monthly salaries. Twenty-five-year period under these extravagant expenditures on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's superfluous employees created nothing; did not cause to advance the Coeur d'Alene Indians to prosperity; Coeur d'Alene Indians only go broke; going worse.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs and superintendents, Department of the Interior, has to confiscate the prorata shares tribal money from old-aged Coeur d'Alene Indians, minor children, to pay the wasteful expenditures on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration. The evidence I have written to you before my two children's prorata share their tribal money taken away from them, \$903.

All Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money is disappearing, wasted on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency administrations. Had Congress probed the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, superintendents, administration, constructing building at the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency at De Smet Mission in Idaho under guise at United States Government expenses, money appropriated by Congress from the United States Treasury, which is not true, said construction of said buildings are at the expenses from Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money; had Congress probed these buildings, would see said buildings of no use, now abandoned, going into dilapidation. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, superintendent, Department of the Interior, are at present seeking new fields for more wastage from Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money or funds held by the United States in trust for the respective tribe, Coeur d'Alene Indians.

The United States Government has no agreement or permanent agreement for expenditure of money out from its United States Treasury; none to Coeur d'Alene Indians.

Congressman COMPTON J. WHITE, consider under your authority the complaints I write you, the wastage of Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money. Introduce a bill in Congress to prohibit the Department of the Interior, Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, superintendent, prohibit not to expenditure Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money or funds held by the United States in trust for the respective tribe, Coeur d'Alene Indian, not to expenditure on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administrations.

Ignore even if a few Coeur d'Alene Indians agree in the past to use Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal on Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration's expenditures; it is without due contemplation.

When public money is appropriated and Coeur d'Alene Indian money is grabbed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, both public money and Coeur d'Alene Indian money are extravagantly expended to no results.

Probe the special appointed Government officer guised to suppress the intoxication liquors out from the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation in Idaho, present Special Officer Tom Claggett, salary paid from Coeur d'Alene Indian tribal money, said special officer has not performed no officer's duty on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation, said special officer is at Yakima, Wash., with his stool pigeons, or in the city of Spokane, Wash., with his stool pigeons. While on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation is lawless, beastly drunkenness going on amongst the Coeur d'Alene Indians in public. Several lives are lost caused by intoxication liquor.

Mr. Congressman WHITE, probe this intoxication-liquor situation. Twenty-five years period paying said special officer for what is not done. Intoxication liquor was never suppressed from Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation. Twenty-five years period said special officers clever scheme, special officers placing a mark on his own money gave his money to his drunkard Indian stool pigeon, instructing said Indian go to that white man, buy some intoxication liquor to make an arrest. This is the special officers clever device to make an arrest. This act suppress nothing.

If you will introduce a bill in Congress to do away with this Government special officer.

The Coeur d'Alene Indians have no representation to bring the actual wrongs existing on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation to the attention of the proper authorities at Washington, D. C., that would probe into the wrong actions on the Supt. A. G. Wilson's administrations at his Moscow, Idaho office, headed by Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, Department of the Interior. The Congress of the United States Government of American, Senate and House of Representatives, appropriates millions and millions of dollars called "Indian appropriation," otherwise not appropriated, Congress should contemplate where that millions of dollars annually Congress' Indian appropriation goes to, is it to be expended into vapor, and Congress probe the total figures from Congress' original Indian appropriation to 1935, the grand total would be billions of dollars expended on Indians' name only. Congress probe what did that billions of dollars expended do for the Indians. The Coeur d'Alene Indians are Indians on their Indian Reservation. No portion is visible that would be apportioned for the Coeur d'Alene Indians from said annual Congress' Indian appropriations. In the Union Calendar, H. R. 6223, Report No. 249, which Congress had passed I studied it, the Coeur d'Alene Indians not mentioned Congress did not appropriate no money for the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administration salary wasteful expenditures to no results.

Mr. Congressman WHITE: If some members from the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and some members from the House of Representatives, members on Committee on Indian Affairs probe each individual Coeur d'Alene Indian home you would find it very poor. If you travel the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation slowly examine what every Indian have and his true condition you would find them very poor, you would find no trace of anything created to benefit the Coeur d'Alene Indian. You would see nothing only poverty.

Yes, indeed; the Coeur d'Alene Indian Agency's administrations and superintendents—Moscow, Idaho, office—are to many some duplicates.

Only United States Government Congress can stop these wasteful expenditures existing on the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation.

The United States American citizens has a damned will against the Coeur d'Alene Indians because they think the Coeur d'Alene Indians are donated showered upon from public money, American citizen tax money what the Congress United States Government, Senate, and House of Representatives appropriates annually called Indian appropriation. In truth Coeur d'Alene Indians not getting it. All I have is land granted to Coeur d'Alene Indians in the year 1877. From when it was pure American United States Government, Senate, and House of Representatives.

Yours respectfully,

PHILIP WILDSHOE.

BLEEDING THE STATES TO DEATH

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THEIR EVENTUAL ANNIHILATION THROUGH FEDERAL USURPATION OF SOURCES OF REVENUE PECULIARLY BELONGING TO THE STATES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I trust that my colleagues will bear with me for a few minutes while I rethresh old straw and talk about a matter in which I was very much interested and about which at one time I thought I knew something, namely, the subject of taxation. I recognize the fact that men much abler and better informed than I am have discussed this matter in your hearing, and I do not labor under the hallucination that I shall contribute anything new. However, my statements are made as a result of my own practical experience. As an attorney at law I specialized in the study of this matter, for years adminis-

tered the corporate, general, and inheritance tax laws of the State of Vermont, and later as general counsel and tax attorney handled excise, income, and all other forms of taxation incident to the transaction of corporate business.

All this was some years ago, and I put it all behind me, and to be perfectly honest with you, I know I have forgotten—and am rather glad of it—many of the rules, regulations, and details which enmesh the general subject. Out of my experience, however, came the conviction, grown stronger through the years, that the Federal Government has no moral right and no business to enter the so-called "field of inheritance or Federal estate taxation."

What I have to say is inspired by the recommendations of the President that in addition to the present estate taxes there should be levied an inheritance succession and legacy tax, and the further recommendation that gift taxes should be imposed. Under the Constitution I suppose it is to be construed that the Federal Government has a legal right, under what is known as the "excise tax", and the power to levy the so-called "estate tax." I insist that there is no logical basis or justification, at least there is not the same logical basis or justification, for such imposition by the Federal Government of such tax, as exists and is inherent in the States themselves.

I have always been opposed to the usurpation of this source of revenue to the States by the Federal Government. The imposition of this tax and the right of the Federal Government to impose it on inheritances rests upon the theory, which probably is correct, in fact the only basis on which it may rest, that it is an excise tax—a tax which the Federal Government has the power to levy, but has no moral right so to do, since the Federal Government has no power over the law of descent and distribution. It is not based on any correct principle. It invades the domain more properly relegated to and reserved to the States. Since property passes by virtue of State laws, not by virtue of any Federal law, such revenue as may be derived from an inheritance tax, which is a tax on the right to inherit property, belongs primarily to the States. It is a foregone conclusion that the several States of this Union are gradually and insidiously being deprived of their rights and prerogatives.

It should not be forgotten that property derives its principal value from the protection it receives from the individual States and from the laws of the several States by which its acquisition, enjoyment, and transfer are made possible and are controlled.

This no man can truthfully deny. Those of you who are interested in conserving whatever rights the States still have left, in preserving the integrity and insuring the perpetuity of the States, constituting this Union, must be on your guard, must consider well what action you shall take. You should not forget that the theory of an excise tax is that it should be based upon a privilege granted by the Government. It has been held that the Federal estate tax is an excise tax and may be imposed; nevertheless, I call your attention to the fact that the privilege of transmitting property at the time of death is exclusively a right of the States, and that no privilege is granted by the Federal Government with or in respect thereto.

The Federal Government should not seek to accomplish social regulation by and through taxation.

The idea of a Federal estate tax was wrong in its inception; is still and always will be wrong. The old maxim that the remedy for wrongs is to forget them is inapplicable in this case for no question "is ever settled until it is settled right."

Although the Government may have the right under the Constitution to impose excise taxes, that alone does not justify the reckless exercise of the power to take from the States revenue which if left to them relieves to some extent, at least, the farmer, the small business man, the real-estate owner, and the average citizen of the State from the burden of already unbearable taxation.

The divine right of kings may have been the plea for feeble tyrants, but the divine right of government is the keystone of human progress and its foundation is found in local government. Without it government sinks into the exercise

of police power and the "Nation becomes a degraded mob." The proposition to superimpose additional Federal estate, inheritance, succession, and gift taxes, means just one thing, and that is the further diminution of revenue for the States, and that heavier tax burdens must be borne by real estate and other tangible property now almost taxed out of existence. The States need every available source of revenue. To destroy values from which the States receive income is to force them to resort to higher taxes and to include the wage earner of limited income in the list of those whose income must be taxed. This law of action and reaction is immutable and incontrovertible. The end may be seen from the beginning.

It is interesting to observe that James Madison in seeking to allay the fears of the people who dreaded the possible aggression of a strong centralized Federal Government, and who apprehended the possibility of some such usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the several States as is contemplated by the so-called "Federal estate tax", and those now recommended by the President, it is interesting to observe, I say, what James Madison says in no. XVI of the *Federalist*, viz:

The Federal and State Governments are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, constituted with different powers, and designed for different purposes. * * *

But ambitious encroachments of the Federal Government, on the authority of the State governments, would not excite the opposition of a single State, or of a few States only. They would be signals of general alarm. Every government would espouse the common cause. A correspondence would be opened. Plans of resistance would be concerted. One spirit would animate and conduct the whole. The same combinations, in short, would result from an apprehension of the Federal, as was produced by the dread of a foreign yoke; and unless the projected innovations should be voluntarily renounced, the same appeal to trial by force would be made in one case as was made in the other. But what degree of madness could ever drive the Federal Government to such an extremity.

That the people of the States should, for a sufficient period of time, elect an uninterrupted succession of men all ready to betray both; * * * that the governments and the peoples of the States should silently and patiently behold the gathering storm, and continue to supply the materials, until it should be prepared to burst upon their own heads, must appear to everyone more like the incoherent dreams of a delirious jealousy, or the misjudged exaggerations of a counterfeit zeal, than like the sober apprehensions of genuine patriotism. * * *

Let us not insult the free and gallant citizens of America * * * with the supposition that they can ever reduce themselves to the necessity of making the experiment by a blind and tame submission to the long train of insidious measures which must precede and produce it. * * *

Patrick Henry, in voicing opposition to the adoption of the Federal Constitution in the Virginia convention, exclaimed:

Where are the purse and sword of Virginia? They must go to Congress. What has become of your country? The Virginian government is but a name. (*Elliott's Debates*, III, pp. 366-410.)

Fear of excessive power in the proposed new Government excited wide-spread opposition to the adoption of the Constitution by the colonists. Justification for such fear was found in the long struggle of the people in the mother country to preserve their rights and liberties. The colonists, with knowledge of the contest between the Parliament and the Stuart kings which lasted nearly all of the seventeenth century, mistrusted usurpation of powers and centralization in government beyond all things else. Their kin across the seas had been participants in this almost interminable struggle. Furthermore, they had just concluded successfully the Revolutionary War, which was brought about by the exercise of centralized powers wielded from a great distance and from beyond the borders of the continent.

To them, all of the serious experiences of mankind, immediate and centuries old, seemed to justify the extraordinary reluctance with which they yielded to the necessity of forming the more perfect union which was proposed. But the necessity for the establishment of such new union with carefully guarded and more centralized powers than previously were thought necessary was apparent to the ablest and most far-seeing statesmen of those times. The Constitution framers, observing the dangers of excessive centralization of powers on one hand and anarchy arising from excessive localization of powers on the other hand, succeeded

in writing into the Constitution that perfect balance of powers on which has rested the security of this governmental structure during the whole period of its existence.

Lord Bryce, with whose writings respecting our system of government there is none to compare, visualized our plan of government and tersely described it in the following language:

Under the plan of the Constitution makers, an American, through a long life, may never be reminded of the Federal Government, except when he votes at a Presidential election, buys a package of tobacco bearing the Federal stamp, lodges a complaint against the post office and opens his trunk for a customs officer on a pier when he comes from a European tour. His direct taxes are paid to officials acting under State laws. The State, or local authority constituted by State statute, registers his birth, appoints his guardian, pays for his schooling, gives him a share in his father's estate, licenses him when he marries or enters a trade, divorces him, enters civil action against him, declares him a bankrupt, and hangs him for murder. The police that guards his home, the local boards which look after the poor, control the highways, impose water rates, manage schools—all these derive their powers from State laws. In comparison with such a number of functions, the Federal Government is but a department of foreign affairs.

But Lord Bryce would report a far different situation were he empowered to revisit us in our present day. He would find the very antithesis to obtain. He would find a scene similar to that visualized by another who warned us against that which he must have seen materializing.

In *The Critical Period in American History*, written by the historian John Fiske, may be found this language:

If the day should ever arrive when the people from the different parts of our country should allow their local affairs to be administered by prefects sent from Washington, and when the self-government of the States shall have been so far lost as that of the Departments of France, or even so far as the counties of England, on that day the progressive political career of the American people will have come to an end, and the hopes that may have been built upon it for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever.

In the early days the proponents of the Constitution took the view that dangers of State encroachments upon Federal powers were greater than the danger of encroachments of the Federal Government upon the powers of the States. Few, if any, tendencies have been witnessed to indicate that there was justification for such fear. History shows that, where the greatest power in government is lodged, greater power is sought, and, except for the prudence and firmness of the people, which Hamilton saw was necessary to the maintenance of this Government, ancient rights, however firmly established, will be lost. There is nothing new in this observation. Human nature has not changed perceptibly in this respect. Power in government affairs begets more power. It has been so always. Vigilance remains as the price of liberty.

Why is it necessary to use the device of a Federal inheritance tax? The present situation, with two Federal estate taxes, is already almost intolerably complicated. Fiduciaries are at their wit's end to know how to close and distribute their estates, in view of the delays and litigation incident to the administration of the two present Federal estate taxes. If to this curious structure is added a Federal inheritance tax, confusion will become worse confounded. I do not understand why if the Government needs more money from this source, it does not either cut out the 80-percent credit provision now existing in the 1926 Federal Estate Tax Act or else increase the rates of the 1934 Federal estate tax. That seems the obvious and simple thing to do. If instead of that a Federal inheritance tax is added, administrative delays will increase very greatly and fiduciaries will be in an even worse hole than they now are. This is because an inheritance tax is much more complicated to administer than is an estate tax. Practically all questions relating to such an inheritance tax must be referred to the Bureau at Washington. Doubtless that Bureau can avail itself of the services of plenty of legally trained men, but such procedure will result, in my judgment, in almost intolerable centralization. I have observed the administration of the Federal estate tax from the outside for a good many years and, in my opinion, its chief difficulty is in bureaucracy and centralization. If this is to be increased it will result in an

unwarrantable increase in the burdens laid upon fiduciaries and in an unwarrantable delay in the rights of heirs, devisees, and legatees. Surely such people have some rights left even though the Government proposes to take away most of the property that they inherit. Even though comparatively little be left to them after the imposition of death taxes, yet as to what little is left they are entitled to know certainly what it will be and to receive it as promptly as possible.

From the point of view of the burdens laid upon fiduciaries, heirs, legatees, and devisees and because I apprehend that the imposition of the proposed Federal inheritance tax will enormously complicate and delay matters. From the point of view of a State official administering a State inheritance tax a proposed Federal inheritance tax will diminish the revenue of the State unless the State chooses to enact rather unfair legislation denying the deductibility of Federal death taxes, whether estate or inheritance, from the gross estate subject to State inheritance tax.

Now, as to the validity of any Federal death tax, whether estate or inheritance. This is generally believed to have been conclusively settled in favor of validity by the decision of *Knowlton v. Moore* (178 U. S. 41 (1900)). I am perhaps imprudent in venturing to doubt that decision and the soundness of the reasoning of the opinion. Chief Justice White wrote a 67-page opinion in which he discussed the matter of death taxation from every conceivable angle. When, however, he came to the main point, namely, whether the Federal Government had any power, under the Constitution, to levy any sort of a death tax, I venture to doubt the soundness of his reasoning. He seems to base his decision upon the fact that the Federal inheritance tax of 1797 was passed at a time when Congress was full of men who had participated in the formation of the National Government and of the Constitutional Convention which preceded it. His argument is that these men presumably knew what was within and what was without the power of Congress, and that if they enacted a Federal inheritance tax it must have been within the power of Congress; and that consequently it was not up to the Supreme Court, a century later, to doubt the validity of that action. (See p. 56 in vol. 178, U. S. Reports.)

It seems to me that this is a rather tenuous argument. At bottom it depends on the theory that the subject of inheritance or estate taxation is not the right or privilege granted by the sovereignty to transmit or inherit but is the transmission or receipt. This seems to me, with the greatest respect to Mr. Chief Justice White, a metaphysical distinction without any real difference. Indeed, I believe that it can be demonstrated to be wrong. It is universally admitted that it is the States and not the Federal Government which grant the right to inherit property from the estates of deceased persons. I think no one will doubt this proposition. If so, it is within the power of any State to defeat any Federal death tax as applied to its own citizens.

All that such State needs to do is to provide, by statute or by amendment to its own constitution, that thereafter the property of all decedents domiciled in such State shall escheat to the State; that such escheated property shall be taken in charge by State officers called "executors" or "administrators" and shall be administered by them and the debts and other expenses paid and the balance—less an amount varying from 1 to 10 percent, being equivalent to present State inheritance taxes—be distributed to the heirs, legatees, or devisees of the decedent. It seems to me fairly certain that the Federal Government could not levy any tax upon property escheating to a State; and if all the property of all decedents escheats to a State, the Federal Government cannot levy any death tax whatever.

If my line of reasoning is correct, it seems to me that any Federal death tax, whether estate or inheritance, has no solid foundation. A death tax is a privilege tax; and a sovereignty which does not afford the privilege cannot impose the tax.

When all is said and done, notwithstanding the legality of the course that has been pursued and is proposed, it is wrong. The Federal Government as such has no moral right to levy an inheritance tax, call it excise or otherwise, which indirectly

puts an additional tax on the property of every citizen of each and all of the several States under the guise of redistributing wealth. If redistribution of wealth is to be accomplished by any such means, certainly let it be done first-hand by the States under whose law the wealth represented by the property is permitted to be transferred. I do not object to the proposition that great fortunes should be broken up, and at their devolution a generous share should be contributed to the State which has made possible the accumulation, and permits the devolution thereof, but I am not in favor of the plans advocated by President Roosevelt and Senator Long. The President's message has been characterized as a demagogic appeal designed to steal the thunder of share-the-wealth spellbinders, and is further evidence of the fact that he is still following the suggestions of the schizophrenic fringe of councilors who surround him, or with whom he has surrounded himself. It is time to stop further centralization of power in the Federal Government; time to stop these poorly disguised attempts by circumlocution to deprive the States of their lifeblood in violation of their reserved powers and rights; time as in the days of William Prynne and King Charles "to rescue the King from his evil councilors" and reestablish before it is everlastingly too late the sovereignty of the States.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that under the Constitution the Federal Government cannot through taxation, or otherwise, sap the sovereignty of the States. The history and the experience of other nations should teach us that only when normal prosperity, based upon confidence and credit, puts the stream of wealth into its natural activity and it is made free from governmental interference can all the people participate in its benefits, and that out of that economic law, and from that law alone, will come those measures which are the objectives sought to be attained under the President's proposed program.

On February 1, 1925, President Coolidge realized that the temper and spirit of Congress disclosed a disposition to sacrifice sound principles of taxation on the altar of expediency, or to enter upon a program of social legislation under the guise and use of the taxing power of the Government, and he said:

I do not believe that the Government should seek social legislation in the guise of taxation. We should approach the question directly, where the arguments for and against the proposed legislation may be clearly presented and universally understood. If we are to adopt socialism it should be presented to the people of this country as socialism and not under the guise of a law to collect revenue. The people are quite able to determine for themselves the desirability of a particular public policy and do not ask to have such policies forced upon them by indirection.

I do insist, again, it is not the function of the Federal Government, through the instrumentality of an excise tax, to attempt to accomplish such social reform, since the right to transfer the property by inheritance is a State right and not one held or had by virtue of any Federal statute.

The suggestion that a super-Federal estate tax and the others enumerated should be imposed is a serious threat against the continued financial stability of the States. It affects the welfare of every single citizen. It concerns every Congressman who has at heart the welfare of those whom he undertakes to represent. It involves the continuation of and the very political life of every State in this Union, for it strikes at the very root, viz, the revenue-producing and yielding power of the State itself, for in the power to tax lies hidden that insidious, destructive, devastating power to destroy.

This, moreover, is not all that should give us pause as patriots, not partisans. The average citizen may not realize that he is paying or will pay his share of the proposed taxes, but the day of reckoning will soon be at hand. Nearly 40 cents of every dollar we earn is paid out in taxes of one kind or another. A continuation of this policy can but result in individual and even national financial ruin. When the people wake up and realize the facts, they will demand relief.

Further, and with respect to a collateral matter, may I suggest that we should not overlook the facts so forcibly brought to the attention of the people of New York by

William C. Breed, chairman of the board of economic council of that State. Without attempting to quote him exactly, he said in substance:

The Government also is favoring the passage of many acts which require readjustment of capitalization, dissolutions, or other corporate action, without consideration of the burden such actions impose under the existing income-tax laws. For example, the proposed Public Utilities Act is designed to force holding companies out of business. If this law is passed, it necessarily means the dissolution or consolidation of many companies. On the other hand, we find certain sections of the income-tax law imposing heavy penalties as the result of dissolutions or consolidations. The public is so concerned with the provisions of the Public Utilities Act itself that it fails even to consider what would be the effect of the passage of such a law on the companies themselves under the provisions of existing tax laws.

It might also be mentioned that under another section of the income-tax law passed last year the dissolution of a corporation whose stock has been held by an individual for over 10 years will precipitate upon that individual a tax penalty of 100 percent of the profits arising from such dissolution, while if the same individual had sold his 10-year stock he would be taxed only 30 percent of the profit therefrom. * * *

This amendment of 1934 was undoubtedly passed to catch the profits retained in holding companies or private investment companies the dissolution of which the Government sought to effect, and yet we find that it has also penalized the stockholders for doing the very act which the Government would apparently like to have brought about. The effect of this provision on dissolutions undertaken for ordinary business reasons and not relating to private holding companies is exceedingly serious, and clearly this provision should be amended.

In studying the conflicting income-tax laws which have been passed, one comes to the conclusion that many of the evils of tax avoidance are in reality created by the very terms of the laws themselves. There is no doubt that our income-tax laws should be studied and broadly revised; there also is no doubt that they can be vastly improved, simplified, and made understandable to the average individual. The chief impediment to any revision of these tax laws, however, is the present-day idea behind all legislation, which is:

Tax everything on every possible theory, so that those who have will have nothing left.

It is certainly true that if this principle of government continues there will be nothing left, not even incentive. * * *

If the Government's present program continues, moreover, the United States bids fair to sink into the condition of Australia of 20 years ago—a great country without hope, a country without hope because of its attempt to socialize everything and everybody, forgetting that the happiness of the average citizen depends upon the business prosperity of the country itself.

But the game of trying to make 2 and 2 equal 6 is about played out, and the average citizen is awakening to the fact that experiments do not produce prosperity or recovery.

Excessive and abusive taxes have caused wide social disturbances and have led to great historical events.

President Coolidge in an address delivered at the National Conference on Inheritance and Estate Taxation in this city in 1925 said:

The position has been taken that the Federal Government should withdraw from the field of estate taxation. This view has much to commend it. The right to inherit property owes its existence, not to any Federal law, but to the laws of the States. Federal estate taxation, therefore, has not the natural excuse which is conceded to State inheritance taxation. The Federal Government being in the field, however, primarily with rates as excessive as those recently adopted, results in a very material decrease in the amount and value of the property upon which the States will have their inheritance tax. If the States are to suffer diminution in revenue from this source, they can make up their losses only by higher tax in other fields. Already the taxes levied by the States upon land are so high as to menace the prosperity of the farmer. For the sake of the revenue which the Federal Government receives from these sources the Federal Government should be careful to see that indirectly it is not taxing the very persons whom it most wishes to relieve.

The Honorable William H. Blodgett, former Commissioner of Taxes of the State of Connecticut, in addressing the National Council of State Legislatures in 1927, most forcibly stated the situation with respect to Federal estate taxation, and I desire in closing to leave with you for your consideration his analysis of the then existing situation, the same in

principle as now obtains, only emphasized by the magnified threat against State rights inherent in the recommendations made. Hear him when he says:

The present Federal estate tax anomaly places the States in a strait-jacket. It is based on the doctrine that the citizen, in whichever State he lives, must pay taxes locally and for State purposes in accordance with the congressional will. The strait-jacket is a presumption of authority and works an injustice to every State in which the citizens have thoughtfully attended to public business. The device accomplishes by indirection that which could not be considered as possible by directly imposing on any State the obligation to enact any kind of tax laws. No one would stand for such direct action by the Congress; such a proposal would not be considered. By the indirection found in the Federal law the same purpose is accomplished. Prior to 1924 the determination of whether the State would or would not have death tax laws was regarded as a matter exclusively of its own concern. Since the passage of this law, while free to make such determination, each State is subjected to penalty for failure to make the determination in accordance with the Federal plan.

The States in the Constitutional Convention yielded the right to the Federal Government to impose taxes only in reliance upon the constitutional limitations as to apportionment and uniformity. It was intended that the Constitution should forbid discrimination by the levying of duties, imposts, or excises upon a particular subject in one State and a different duty, impost, or excise on the same subject in another State. The burden was to be uniform in all States.

The necessity for uniform death taxes is no greater than the necessity for imposing uniform personal income taxes or uniform corporation net-income taxes. No reason exists for uniformity in the several States with respect to such taxes. Indeed, uniformity in this regard is undesirable except as there may exist uniform sentiment in the States imposing such taxes and other uniform conditions too varied in character to be enumerated. If the strait-jacket principle is sound, other strait-jackets, possibly and probably less comfortably fitting, may be devised in course of time to fit other States which refuse to obey the congressional will. By application of Federal power of the purse, the discomfort of three States now may be slight in comparison with that which other States may feel in a decade or two.

If it were necessary for the Federal Government to establish such principle as underlies this tax, no good citizen would inveigh against it. Whether constitutional or unconstitutional, this law not only is in conflict with the spirit of the fundamental law but it destroys that equilibrium essential to the progressive political career of the American people. As the historian Fiske pointed out:

"The hopes that may have been built upon it (the Constitution of the United States) for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever."

A large majority of Americans feel as does President Frank, of the University of Wisconsin, as we watch the relentless encroachment of the state, in one European nation after another, upon private enterprise and political liberty, that we want more than ever to will to our sons an America in which a great economic leadership has made possible the preservation of the inspiring advantages of private enterprise and political liberty by boldly recasting its economic policies for the distribution of wealth in the light of its technical processes for the production of wealth.

After swallowing whole a program for the control of production he says:

The creation of scarcity, and the boosting of prices, which has always been the dream of reactionary economic leadership, a radical politics sets the stage for heavier and heavier taxation of the results of successful enterprise in order that Government may execute lavish public works, on the theory that this will effect the spread of buying power necessary to stabilize our economic order.

This, it seems to me, is missing the point. I do not suggest that industrial enterprise, incomes, and inheritances cannot stand heavier impacts of taxation. I insist only that we cannot build a great civilization by lavish expenditures on even the most desirable public works unless concurrently we solve the problem of clothing the bodies, feeding the stomachs, and freeing from fear the hearts of the masses in and through the Nation's business, industry, and agriculture. The place to solve the economic problem is at the source where policies respecting wages, hours, prices, and profits are formulated. It is no answer to permit an economic system to play havoc with the lives of millions and then step into the picture with stringent taxes to take care of these millions with the munificence of a political Santa Claus. In the end such procedure will wreck the system that must produce the wealth and sap the self-respect of the millions who learn to lean on the bounty of Government.

I direct your attention to the undeniable fact that never were those in favor of centralization of power in the Federal Government more active than in these very days. The life-blood of the States is being insidiously sapped by leechlike

governmental agencies whose number is legion. The eventful disintegration of the body politic and the loss of the identity of the several States is most seriously threatened.

But the States will not submit if they be but aroused to a realizing sense of what confronts them. The sentiment of the country has not been better expressed than by learned Senator GEORGE when he recently said:

The ultimate preservation of the Union depends upon the retention, unimpaired, of the dual system of government set up by the Constitution. The liberty of the citizen rests at last upon local self-government; upon local institutions administered by local authority responsive and responsible to local opinion. The decision of the Supreme Court does not call for amending the Constitution or for the surrender of the reserved powers of the States over the intimate personal business and social affairs of the people.

The decision of the Court calls for the full assumption by Congress of its constitutional responsibility in the consideration of legislative proposals. Nothing but disaster lies ahead if those who know well the political theories of history and are yet lacking in the vital sense of the realities of life are permitted to shatter the American system of government and to attempt to remold it in accordance with their desires. It is yet our hope that these theorists, many of whom have encamped in Washington, will have their day and pass away.

In a recent editorial the Constitution called attention to the warning of Daniel Webster of the dangers of tampering with the Constitution. He said in an address on the hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth:

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government; who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty; who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again."

I agree fundamentally with those who contend that there should be a more equitable distribution of wealth and that concentration of it in the hands of a few is to be deprecated; but I am opposed to attempts to redistribute it by imposing the Federal super estate and inheritance taxes in the manner proposed. If redistribution is to be effected in any such way or manner, it can and should be attempted and accomplished through and by the States along the lines I have suggested.

There can be no question that the extraordinary governmental expenditures which have now reached proportions for which there is no peace-time parallel in the history of this or any other country must be met by taxation. The manner in which it is done and the methods used, however, should not strike at the heart of the body politic. The spending program must be checked. Its continuation threatens the financial stability of the Government, so do also the plans and policies defined in the message of the President. Our form and system of government are imperiled, for in the sapping of the lifeblood of the several States lies the evident threat of their eventual annihilation.

The further growth of the hydra-headed centralization monster must be stopped, and now.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S TAX PROGRAM WHICH WOULD GRADUALLY REDISTRIBUTE THE WEALTH OF THE COUNTRY, AS WELL AS THE BURDENS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a radio address which I delivered today on the President's tax program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address which I delivered today over a national radio broadcast.

My friends, on last Wednesday, June 19, President Roosevelt delivered to Congress one of the most important messages that has ever come from a Chief Executive of the United States, in which he advocated a policy that would not only tend to redistribute the wealth of this Nation, but it would also redistribute the burdens of government, through the taxing power.

That message constitutes one of the brightest rays of hope that has dawned for the overburdened taxpayers of America since the close of the Civil War.

He is not advocating a radical or a destructive policy, but a safe, sane, and constructive constitutional method of raising the necessary revenues to meet our obligations and to gradually redistribute the wealth of the Nation in such a way as to give the children of this and coming generations an opportunity in this world.

In recent years we have found ourselves in the midst of a paradoxical depression that is without a parallel in all history. We live in the richest country in all the world. With a gentle climate, a fertile soil, and an abundant rainfall, our lands produce every agricultural commodity necessary for the maintenance and comforts of mankind.

We produce more wheat, more corn, more hogs, more cotton, more dairy products, in fact, more of all agricultural as well as manufactured commodities of every kind than the American people can possibly use.

Our natural resources are unlimited. In fact, we have the world's reserve supplies of raw materials and they are well distributed throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The inventive genius of America has given us an ascendancy and a control over the forces of nature never before attained in all the history of the human race.

And yet, we have seen millions of our people hungry and other millions insufficiently clothed. We have seen bread lines stretching down the streets of our cities, while farmers were losing their homes, seeing them sold for debts or confiscated for taxes.

Practically every individual who owned a home, or tried to own a home, has been loaded with debts and burdened with taxes that he found himself unable to pay. Almost every county, municipality, school district, or road district, and practically every State in the Union, and even the Federal Government itself is burdened with debts and bonded obligations that it seems almost impossible to pay.

Yet, we scarcely owe a single dollar beyond the confines of the United States. On the other hand, foreign countries owe this Nation billions of dollars, and at the same time, they and their citizens owe private individuals and private enterprises in America billions of dollars more.

What is the trouble? Why all this financial distress in the richest land in all the world, practically the only country that does not owe any debts beyond its own borders?

It is maldistribution of wealth. We are cursed with a system of economic feudalism that has overawed, browbeaten, or controlled by insidious methods or continuous pressure, the forces of democracy and so dominated the legislative programs of this country during the last 60 years that it has concentrated the wealth of this Nation into the hands of a few families.

We are told that less than 10 percent of our population now own more than 90 percent of our wealth. They are pyramiding their fortunes and passing them on down from generation to generation, ever increasing them by the natural accretion of interest accumulations, while the rest of the 120,000,000 Americans are literally grinding their lives out to even meet the interest they have to pay.

They began by accumulating vast fortunes out of the Civil War. They accumulated more through a high protective tariff, which levied an annual tribute upon every human being in America. Through this method, they sapped the economic vitality of the agricultural States, using the powers of Government through Federal pension and political patronage to hold enough of those States in line to guarantee them supreme control.

While governments were instituted and developed among men primarily to keep the strong from oppressing the weak, the powers of this Government have been used in the past to help the strong oppress the weak.

More fortunes were accumulated, and therefore more wealth was concentrated through a manipulation of public utilities, overcapitalization, sale of watered stocks, and exorbitant service charges. They even manipulated the currency by expanding through the Federal Reserve System and contracting in the same way—raising prices for a period until people adjusted themselves to higher price levels, incurred debts, fixed their tax rates, and floated bonds for necessary improvements—then contracted that currency, drove down prices, and are now demanding that those debts be paid with high dollars, and on deflated commodity values.

The people have about reached the limit of their endurance. They know there is something wrong with our present system, and they are beginning to realize what it is. They are demanding, and they are going to continue to demand, that there be a redistribution of the wealth of this country, and that the burdens of taxation be placed where they belong.

The President has pointed the way.

This is a sane and orderly method of solving this question. We do not need any amendments to the Constitution to give Congress this power. Congress already has that power under the Constitution as it now stands.

If you will let me write the tax bills, I will balance the Budget, pay a reasonable old-age pension, pay off the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates, and pay off the national debt in 25 years. I would place the same burden of taxes on the rich and opulent, in proportion to their wealth, that we are now placing upon the poor, the man of moderate means.

Today, the man most heavily burdened with taxes is the farmer and the home owner and the small business man, whose entire profits and invariably the equity in whose property is taken to pay his taxes. The one element that has grown richer as a result of

the World War has been the ones into whose hands the wealth of the Nation has been concentrated.

The reports of the Bureau of Internal Revenue show that in 1921 there were 21 individuals in the United States with incomes of a million dollars a year. In 1929, there were 513 individuals with incomes of a million dollars a year. Their number had multiplied 25 times, while the man of moderate means had gone down in the economic scale. The rich had grown richer by leaps and bounds, while the poor had grown poorer.

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied."

But gentlemen who have always represented the predatory interests of the country in the House and Senate, and who now vociferously proclaim their desire to prevent the further issuance of tax-exempt securities, studiously refrain from advocating the real remedy, and that is the raising of inheritance taxes and making the ones who own tax-exempt securities now bear their part of the burdens of government.

Our inheritance taxes are ridiculous. They are infinitesimal compared with the taxes which the average American has to bear.

Just before the passage of the last tax bill, I secured copies of the inheritance-tax rates for both France and Great Britain, and compared them with the inheritance-tax rates in the United States.

Here is a sample of the comparison: If a man died in the United States and left \$100,000, his estate would pay a tax of \$1,500. In England, it would pay \$9,000; and in France \$36,997.78.

In this country, an estate of \$300,000 would pay a tax of \$19,500; in England it would pay \$28,000; while in France it would pay \$130,789.78. In this country an estate of \$500,000 would pay a tax of \$42,500; in England, \$105,000; and in France, \$234,373.78.

In this country, an estate of \$1,000,000 would pay \$117,500; in England, it would pay \$270,000; and in France \$504,373.78.

I have long advocated the French rates for this country.

Men talk about taxing the profits of the next war. I want to adequately tax the profits of the last war. Then there will not be any next war, at least in your day and mine.

The people of large fortunes, as a rule, are the ones who invest their money in tax-exempt securities. They are the ones who seek and find that storm cellar. They are the ones who made fortunes out of the war, coining their millions out of the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of the world. They are the ones who made their millions out of the tariff, by levying tribute upon everything the average American buys, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age is laid away.

They are the ones that we must reach if we ever expect to balance the Budget and meet the responsibilities of this Government and redistribute the wealth of the Nation so as to give the rising generation a chance in this world. Let's make American money serve the American people, instead of being used to buy titled husbands for rich heiresses of concentrated wealth.

This measure should be passed now, and I, for one, shall insist on Congress staying in session until it is put through. We ought not to think of adjourning until this measure becomes a law.

Then we can repeal some or all of our present nuisance taxes.

This will be Democracy's answer to socialism, communism, and all the other radical and dangerous influences to American institutions. It will assure equal opportunities to the children of the future, and, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, it will inspire us with renewed hope that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report for printing under the rule on the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for research into the basic laws and principles relating to agriculture, and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work, and a more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges.

BONDS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 7765, to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey calls up the bill H. R. 7765, and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill seeks to relieve certain officials of the District

of Columbia from giving official bonds. What officials does it embrace, I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mrs. NORTON. The Commissioners of the District and surveyor and other officials.

Mr. BLANTON. What others?

Mrs. NORTON. The bill merely repeals the act which provided for the giving of bonds by certain District officials. There is no reason now why these officials should be required to give bonds, as they have nothing whatever to do with the funds of the District.

Mr. BLANTON. How many officials besides the Commissioners are relieved from giving official bonds?

Mrs. NORTON. About 30, and none of them has anything to do with the handling or disbursing of money. Therefore, they should not be required to give bond.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there is now in effect a wise law which has been in force since 1878 that these thirty-odd officials of the District should give bond. Why should we now repeal it? It is no disgrace for an honest official to give a bond.

Mrs. NORTON. Why should they be compelled to do so, since they are not acting in a fiduciary relationship?

Mr. BLANTON. Once in a while there is a dishonest official. This bill does away with the necessity for giving a bond and relieves them of that, when the law has required it continuously since 1878.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mrs. NORTON. They have nothing whatever to do with the spending of money, so why should they be compelled to give a bond?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, they handle business here running into millions of dollars on contracts. We have given them \$41,000,000 for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, and they have control of every official who will spend it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentlewoman will not call this bill up at this time.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I object to the request limiting debate. We want some time to discuss this bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7765; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate be confined to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and 15 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to debate a bill of this importance in 15 minutes if we had all the time of the opposition. This bill is too important to be rushed through the Congress.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman he may have all the time allotted to the opposition?

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to have 30 minutes of the time to yield some to my colleagues who are opposing this bill.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, that is irregular. I object to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the lady from New Jersey?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7765) to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate

the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 103, ch. 180), entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia" be, and the same hereby is, amended by repealing the provision "and shall, before entering upon the duties of the office, each give bond in the sum of \$50,000, with surety as is required by existing law", and said section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The said Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding, to determine which officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall hereafter be required to give, or renew, bond for the faithful discharge of their duties and to fix the penalty of any such bond.

Sec. 2. That section 1578, chapter LV, of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1424), entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", is hereby amended so as to read:

"The surveyor shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation before the Commissioners that he will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of his office, which oath shall be deposited with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

Sec. 3. That section 1592 of said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is amended so as to read:

"The assistant surveyor shall take the same oath his principal is required to take, and may, during the continuance of his office, discharge and perform any of the official duties of his principal."

Sec. 4. That said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is further amended by repealing in its entirety section 1597 thereof.

Sec. 5. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] is recognized.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this bill merely repeals the act of June 20, 1874. At that time the Commissioners of the District of Columbia did handle the funds of the District. Today they do not. It does not seem necessary to compel them to give a bond for \$50,000 when they do not handle any funds. There are perhaps 30 people who come under the provisions of this act. None of the 30 people handle any money of the District.

The second paragraph of the first section is prompted by the belief that in a list of thirty-odd officers and employees who are now required to give bond there are perhaps more than a few whose duties do not reasonably require the giving of a bond or whose responsibilities do not justify a bond in the amount now required.

As I have said, the whole matter hinges on the law of 1874, and the present conditions in the District of Columbia are now changed and there is no necessity for putting those men to the trouble and expense of getting bonds, when they positively do not handle any funds in the District of Columbia.

I do not think there is any other salient fact concerned with the bill, and I do not think there is anything more to be said about it. It is simply a question of having the Commissioners and other officials go to the trouble and expense of procuring a bond when they do not handle any funds of the District, and they should not be required to do so. There is no justification for this requirement.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in 1878 the Congress wisely provided that the high officials of the District of Columbia should give a bond. That has been the law of the District since 1878. The District Commissioners and those officials handle just as much authority in money now as they did in 1878. There is no difference at all. Their responsibility has not changed one iota since 1878.

Is this doing away with official bonds something that Congress wants done? Is this something that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia wants? Did this bill come from her? No. Did it come from her committee? No. Did it come from any committee of the Congress? No. I will show you where it came from. It came from the officers who are now required to give bonds.

They are trying to get out from under. Why? No honest official should object to giving a bond. A bond is not for the protection of the official. It is for the protection of the people he serves. This bill does not come from the people whom those officers serve. It is not from the people of the District of Columbia. They are not asking that their officials be relieved from giving bonds. This bill comes from the officials themselves. I want to read what those officials say, and I read it from the committee report. This is what started this bill. It was prepared down in the District Building by the Commissioners. It was not prepared up here by any Congressional committee. They prepared this bill down in the District Building and they sent it up here to be passed. They prepared it only recently.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to read this first, and then I will yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment, yes; not now. I read from the report:

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 24, 1935.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MADAM: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to transmit herewith draft of a proposed bill to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—

which repeals the laws requiring them to give bonds.

Now I yield to the lady from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not true the Commissioners send up nearly all the bills that come before the District Committee and before the Appropriations Committee as well?

Mr. BLANTON. No. It is true they send up many of the bills to the lady's legislative committee, but they do not send up any bills to the Committee on Appropriations. The estimates that come to the Committee on Appropriations are estimates that come from the President's Budget, and before they can get anything to our committee they must go to the President's Budget and submit their estimates and let the Director of the Budget pass upon them. Then, if they can get by the Budget Bureau, the estimates come to the Congressional Committee on Appropriations from the Budget.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman that it seems a pity that they do not send their recommendations to the committee of which the gentleman is a member, because if they did perhaps we would not have the disgraceful conditions we now have in the District with inadequate hospital facilities, inadequate schools, and everything else for which appropriations are necessary. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Let us see whom the gentlewoman is criticizing. On the Committee on Appropriations are the following: Mr. BUCHANAN, of Texas; Mr. TAYLOR, of Colorado; Mr. OLIVER, of Alabama; Mr. SANDLIN, of Louisiana; Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. WOODRUM, of Virginia; Mr. ARNOLD, of Illinois; Mr. BOYLAN, of New York; Mr. PARKS, of Arkansas; Mr. LUDLOW, of Indiana, and many other good Democrats. Then, on the Republican side, she is criticizing one of the finest legislators in Washington, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER, one of the finest gentlemen I ever knew, a man of eminent legislative qualifications. [Applause.] He is the leader of the other side on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just one minute. My distinguished colleague from New Jersey is criticizing also our beloved friend the gentlewoman from California, who is a prominent member of the Committee on Appropriations. [Applause.] She exerts a wonderful influence over the Committee on Appropriations. We listen to her carefully when she has anything to say on that Committee on Appropriations. Whatever she wants done, she asks of us with a smile, and we grant her request almost even before she asks it.

Our distinguished friend from New Jersey is criticizing my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], one of the most conscientious men I have ever seen serve in Congress—a man who is sympathetic to every single thing that could appeal to humanitarian motives, who never turns down anything that ought not to be turned down.

Mrs. NORTON. I want to say to the gentleman that I thought he was the entire Appropriations Committee for the District of Columbia. From what we hear on the floor one would not know that anybody else was on the committee.

I want to state further that I am not criticizing the gentleman from New York nor any other member of that committee.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the distinguished lady will not cut that out of her remarks, because I deem it a great compliment.

Mrs. NORTON. I am not in the habit of taking my remarks out of the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the best campaign speech that ever was made for me.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman is welcome to it.

Mr. BLANTON. Coming from such a distinguished Democrat as the leader of the Democracy of New Jersey, I would not take the world for what my friend has said about my standing on that committee.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman is very welcome to what I have said if he can derive any satisfaction or consolation from it.

Mr. BLANTON. Getting back to this bill, my good friends on this committee should look more carefully, I am afraid, into some of these bills the Commissioners prepare and send up here to be O. K'd. without due consideration.

Mrs. NORTON. Can the gentleman explain why the Surveyor of the District should be compelled to give a \$20,000 bond, unless the gentleman likes these bonding companies in the District? That may be so, of course.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know a single bonding company, and do not know any person representing any of them. My only interest is to see the people protected by proper bonds. In view of the fact that the gentlewoman from New Jersey, the chairman of the committee, has an hour's time, she can answer me after I get through. She might disturb my train of thought, because I must listen whenever she interrupts. I hope she will not interrupt me any further until I get through and then I will not take up so much time, and I think I have something of importance to tell my colleagues.

I am not here just to oppose a bill because it can be opposed. I do not oppose many of the bills this committee brings in here. Why, I sat here the other day and let them pass about 10 bills without opposing any of them. Whenever they have a good bill I never raise my voice against it but help them to pass it, but when the District Commissioners who, since 1878, by act of Congress have been required to give bonds for the faithful performance of their duties to the 500,000 people living in Washington, whenever they try to get out from under that responsibility and try to repeal the law, and quit giving bonds, I must rise on this floor and raise my voice against it.

Now let us get the facts which nobody in this House denies. It has been the law since 1878 that these bonds should be given. If there is a Member here who denies that, I yield for the purpose. No one says a word in protest, so that is admitted to be a fact.

Mr. McFARLANE. Since 1874.

Mr. BLANTON. No; since 1878. The organic act of the District of Columbia which is in force right now and has been in force ever since 1878 was passed in 1878, and it required that these bonds be given. It has not been changed since that time. They have given bonds since 1878. It was in vogue when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and his splendid committee made its investigation of District affairs; and I take my hat off to him for the splendid work he did a few years ago.

Why should this bond requirement now be changed? Are these officers any better than the high officials of your States? Are they any better than the State officers in Baltimore, Md.? Every single one of those high officials of Maryland, whose capital is at Annapolis, but who spend most of their time in Baltimore City, have to give bonds.

They all give bonds. It is no reflection on them. It is simply for the protection of the people of Maryland.

Let us take the great Commonwealth of Virginia, whose capital is Richmond. Every single high official of the Commonwealth of Virginia gives an official bond. It is for faithful performance. It does not militate against their service but is simply for the interests of the people that they give the bond. My distinguished colleague from New Jersey says that because they do not actually handle with their own hands the \$41,000,000 that we gave them for next year they should not give a bond.

Mr. Chairman, they make contracts involving hundreds of thousands of dollars. I sat at one time on a committee that investigated some of these contracts. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], who is now in the United States Senate was the chairman of the committee, and I sat with him on the committee that investigated affairs in the District of Columbia.

We found a former Commissioner who was in the hardware business making contracts involving thousands of dollars with his own firm. He was not giving out competitive bids to other people in the same business. When we brought him before us and confronted him with the situation, it was not long before he resigned his position. We found lots of that going on here in the District of Columbia. They are on the inside and control action on big Government contracts. This bond is for faithful performance and prevents them from doing things of that kind, things that smack of dishonesty.

May I say it has been the greatest safeguard for the people of Washington that this Congress has had control of the business affairs of the District of Columbia. It is this Congress that has kept the District honest. It is this Congress that has kept the District business affairs free of taint, free of fraud, and free of dishonor.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOEPEL. Does not the gentleman think that we should apply our time for effectively legislating for thousands and thousands of inhabitants of other cities where there is so much distress and allow the District of Columbia to legislate for itself? There is too much distress in the country, and we are worrying about one little city, when, as a matter of fact, we should be worrying about all of them.

Mr. BLANTON. When the gentleman from California has been here a few more years and has properly adapted himself to legislative duties, and has had a kind of perspective taking in the whole of the United States, he will not make a remark like that. That is the remark of a newcomer. It is the remark of somebody who is uninformed of Washington and the people of the District of Columbia. And I do not reflect on new Members. Some here are among our most valuable colleagues, and are some of the brightest, ablest men in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this 10-mile square, known as the "District of Columbia", known as "Washington, D. C.", is the Nation's seat of government. Back yonder when they framed the Constitution of the United States they put a provision in there, years before we moved to Washington, that there should be acquired and established in this vicinity a seat of government 10 miles square that should be absolutely controlled by the Congress of the United States. Do you know why they put that in the Constitution? It was because for years previous to that the legislators representing the country had been deviled and harassed to death. We had the Nation's Capital at Baltimore at one time. We had it at York, Pa., at one time. We had it in New York. We had it in Princeton, N. J. We had it at Annapolis. We had it in Philadelphia. But on June 15, 1800, the Capital was

moved to our Government's own seat of affairs here in Washington, where we owned that seat of government and where the framers of the Constitution wisely provided that Congress should forever control the affairs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from California to take this home with him to think about this summer. When we moved the Capital down here, do you know that they did not dare to raise the prices on the Government of the United States? Did you know that all the lots here that the Government sold back to the people were sold for less than a total of \$1,000,000? There are lots right here in Washington that when we moved here were not worth \$50 and by reason of our plant here in Washington some are today worth \$500,000. Did you know that?

Mr. Chairman, that is why the people of Washington cannot vote. It is because the framers of the Constitution wanted the absolute control of this 10-mile square, and therefore they put in the Constitution that the people who saw fit to live here could not vote. When we moved our Government here from Philadelphia on June 15, 1800—135 years ago—did you know that every person who lived in Washington then knew if he stayed here he could not vote? Did you know that every person who has moved here since did so with the knowledge that if he wanted to stay in Washington he could never vote? They stayed here and came here with a full knowledge of their rights, and they have seen fit to live here in the Nation's Capital and enjoy all of the benefits that we have given them during this 135 years, knowing that they could not vote. And there is a good logical reason why the good people of Washington do not want a vote here.

There never will be a vote in Washington, because it is against the Constitution, and the people of the United States are never going to change this provision of the Constitution. This is one 10-mile square that we are going to keep for the people of the United States. We are going to keep it free from domination of voters. It is our Nation's Capital; it is where the Congress sits; it is where the laws are passed; it is where the Government, through its Constitution, wisely provided a place that should be controlled absolutely by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much pleasure to the wonderful oration of my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], but I disagree with his view of this proposed legislation.

I can see no more reason why the District Commissioners should be bonded, or the surveyor of the District, than to bond Members of Congress. A District Commissioner does not collect or expend any money. The surveyor does not collect or disburse any money—not one penny—but it is necessary for the District to pay for bonds of \$120,000 for these three officials. This is very nice business for the bonding companies, but it is not very good business for the District of Columbia or for the people here who are paying the cost of running the District government. There is not any reason why we should bond Members of Congress. We take an oath of office to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the country. The District Commissioners take an oath of office, as does the surveyor, and in view of the fact they handle no finances, why should we give this lucrative business to the bonding companies when there is no danger of the District Commissioner or the surveyor absconding with any money?

Mr. BLANTON. If I yield the gentleman 5 minutes of my time, will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; just a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. WOOD. Just ask the question, I do not need any more time.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose the surveyor, who does not handle any money, should be bribed by somebody to run

a crooked line and someone is injured in the sum of thousands of dollars, his bond would cover malfeasance in office and would be a protection to the people injured against any such fraud or dishonesty.

Mr. WOOD. I beg to differ from the gentleman. The bond does not cover a mistake in a survey.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not say a mistake but fraud, and it covers malfeasance in office.

Mr. WOOD. The bond given by a Commissioner or by the surveyor refers to nothing except misappropriation of money.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman a lawyer?

Mr. WOOD. I know what these bonds cover.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman a copy of the bond there—he will see it covers malfeasance in office.

Mr. WOOD. I know these bonds do not protect either the District or the people from a mistake by the surveyor. There is a right of action at law.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman a lawyer?

Mr. WOOD. No; I am not.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman a copy of the bond there?

Mr. WOOD. I do not have to be a lawyer to know the general rules with respect to bonding companies. I think I know as much about bonding companies as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I suspect the gentleman knows more about that than I do, although I am a lawyer.

Mr. WOOD. I decline to yield further. The gentleman has taken up about all of my time now.

There is not anything further I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, but I can see no reason why the District Commissioners should be bonded any more than the officers of any other municipality in the United States who do not handle any finances of a municipality. This is simply fine business for the bonding company and brings no benefit to the District or the Government.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know how much the Commissioners are compelled to pay for these bonds?

Mr. WOOD. I do not know the regular bonding rates here.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. They have to pay it out of their own pockets, do they not?

Mr. WOOD. No; the District pays it, I understand. Of course, a Commissioner could not very well pay the fee on a \$50,000 bond per annum, as it would amount to several hundred dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time and also the 5 minutes that the gentleman from Texas yielded me.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO].

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, it is amusing on District day to listen to the gentleman from Texas—always ready and willing to take the floor, and oftentimes taking advantage of not having a quorum, and then ridiculing, as he calls them, the "new Members."

The gentleman from Texas has told us everything except on this occasion why he does not want to save some money for the Treasury. He has always taken the floor as the watchdog of the Treasury. When the District comes into the House and makes a recommendation to save money for the District, because of money paid out as premiums for bonds, which has nothing to do with the District because the men who are bonded handle no funds, and therefore are unable to misappropriate anything, and if there is any misfeasance in office we have the courts open, he objects.

The gentleman from Texas has told us when the Capital was in Pennsylvania, when it was in Maryland, and then when it was brought back here as a Capital, where it owns the land, but he failed to tell us what price the Government paid for this valuable piece of land. He did not tell us that it was the colonial estates that had given the land to the Government.

He emphasized the fact that the land was worth nothing. Of course it was worth nothing, the same as every piece of land in the country at some time was worth nothing.

So in order to kill time he talks about everything under the sun except the real issue. I would like to have him tell the Members of the House why he is always picking on the District. Since he has been on the Appropriations Committee he has constantly been cutting down the appropriations for the District. He is constantly helping to take away assessable property, and now when the District wants to save a few dollars in order that it may benefit, he comes in here and complains when we are asking to cut down appropriations that they say are very extravagant. We are not asking to cut down any extravagant appropriations. We are simply asking to save a few dollars that are paid for bonds by officials who handle no funds and cannot misappropriate funds. I hope the House will support the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us whether these officials are covered by a blanket bond or individual bonds?

Mr. PALMISANO. Individual bonds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has any attempt been made to cover these officials by a blanket bond?

Mr. PALMISANO. No. This law was enacted years ago when the Commissioners had charge of the funds. Since that time they have been made merely budget directors, or commissioners, and they handle no funds. When the question was brought up in the committee I asked whether the Commissioners had control over contracts.

I was then informed that they had not even the last word on contracts. Realizing who the people were who were required to give a bond, the Commissioners of the District, and wondering whether they could do some sort of trickery work in reference to contracts, I asked the question, and they said "No"; that they have not the last say on contract. So there is no need to require a bond of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do these individuals carry the expense of the bond personally, or is it a District expense?

Mr. PALMISANO. I think it is a District expense, because their income would not justify paying for a \$50,000 bond.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can any member of the committee tell us what would be saved in bond premiums if this bill were enacted into law?

Mr. PALMISANO. I do not know, but it might be about \$1,500.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do the Commissioners have the power to initiate or partly confirm a contract pertaining to any kind of property?

Mr. PALMISANO. No; the Budget Director has control of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Have the Commissioners any power over any kind of property, not just cash?

Mr. PALMISANO. I do not think so. The thing I had in mind at the time was contracts, and I asked whether it would be dangerous to permit them to officiate without bonds, in view of their power over contracts, and I was informed that they had not the say on contracts.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The total annual saving which this bill would bring about is about \$1,500?

Mr. PALMISANO. One thousand five hundred dollars to two thousand dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes in which to reply to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO].

Over in his State every little justice of peace is under bond. Do you know why he is under bond? For faithful performance of duty.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. PALMISANO. Does the gentleman realize that those justices of the peace collect fines which are to be returned to the State?

Mr. BLANTON. They may do that, but not in large amounts.

Mr. PALMISANO. Very well; they should be bonded.

Mr. BLANTON. These District Commissioners control the expenditure of \$40,000,000 annually. How about the county attorneys? Do they handle money? Some county attorneys and some district attorneys in some States are required to give bond.

Mr. WOOD. What kind of attorneys are under bond?

Mr. BLANTON. All of them in some States.

Mr. WOOD. Not in my State.

Mr. BLANTON. They are in some States.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman knows that the county attorneys handle funds in claims of any consequence or property.

Mr. BLANTON. How about county surveyors? The surveyors do not handle any funds. Practically all county surveyors in the various States are under bond. This bill would relieve the surveyor in Washington from being under bond.

Mr. BEITER. There are no county surveyors. County engineers do the surveying.

Mr. BLANTON. In some States like Texas we have county surveyors. They have county surveyors in many of the States. They have them in your State, and your State, and your State [nodding to several Members]. Every one of them is under bond.

Mr. MILLARD. Does anyone know the form of this bond? I have been listening to argument here for 20 minutes and nobody seems to know whether it covers misappropriation of funds or malfeasance or misfeasance.

Mr. BLANTON. Every lawyer in the House knows that every official bond covers not only misappropriation of funds but also it covers faithful performance of duty and provides against malfeasance in office. It makes that official responsible for every malfeasance in office. If he purposely enters into some fraud against the people he serves, those people who are damaged by it can go into court and make him pay for it on his bond. Many notaries have been sued for damages for making false certificates.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Does not the gentleman think that the moral influence alone exercised by the bond is worth the price of it?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, that is correct. It is worth everything. Very few officials default and the reason for it is because most of them are honest, and they are all under bond, and the moral effect deters the dishonest in many cases. It is an unwise procedure for Congress to relieve high officials of the District of Columbia from the necessity of giving bonds. It has worked well here since 1878.

Let me call your attention to something funny that my friend from Maryland, Mr. PALMISANO, said. He said it was not necessary to require bonds, because if they were guilty of malfeasance in office you could prosecute them in a criminal court. What good would that do? It would not get any money back. If a surveyor deliberately accepted a bribe and ran a crooked line and defrauded somebody out of \$10,000 and he did not have anything that you could attach by law, what good would it do to prosecute him criminally? It would not get the money back. It is the bond that stands between him and unfaithful service to the people. The bond makes whole the fraud and dishonesty.

This is nothing to me, personally. If you want to relieve all of these Washington officials of bonds, do so, but what kind of explanation are you going to make to all of your local officials when you go back home, who were forced to give bond? They will come to you and say, "Congressman, I want you to help me to get a law passed in the State legislature relieving me of a bond. I notice up in Washington where the District Commissioners got tired of being under bond, and wanted to evade responsibility, sat down and drew up a law to relieve them of giving bonds and sent it to the District Committee and the District Committee reported it and while BLANTON made a fight against the bill, you voted to relieve them and I want you to help relieve me." What will you say to that? I have done my full duty when

I have finished my speech against this bill, and when I vote against it. I cannot do more.

Mr. PALMISANO. Will the gentleman tell the Members if there are any officers in the State of Texas who do not handle money who give bonds to the extent of \$50,000? It may be true they are under a nominal bond.

Mr. BLANTON. If I tell the gentleman of about 5,000 unimportant officers in Maryland who do not handle any money at all who are under bond, will he withdraw this bill, and not pass it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield myself 5 minutes more. I am going to accept the gentleman's challenge. I will name 5,000 officers in Maryland who do not handle any money at all for the State or for the people and who are under bond. They are notaries public, and everyone of them you have in Maryland is under bond, is he not? What is it for? It is for faithful performance of service. It is to keep him from making a false certificate. When some crook comes to him and represents himself to be Mr. Goldsborough and says he is making a deed to somebody for Mr. Goldsborough's property, if that notary does not ascertain who that man is and find out that he is not Goldsborough, he is guilty of malfeasance in office, and he can be sued on his bond for damages. That is what the bonds are for. It is to protect the people from dishonest practices.

Mr. WOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not yield now, as I do not want to take up too much time.

Mr. PALMISANO. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. Very well. I yield to the gentleman, since he is on the committee handling the bill.

Mr. PALMISANO. It is true notaries do give bond.

Mr. BLANTON. Why do you not relieve them?

Mr. PALMISANO. But it is a nominal bond; not a \$50,000 bond.

Mr. BLANTON. They are about \$1,500 bonds in most States. They range from \$1,000 to about \$2,500.

Mr. PALMISANO. Very well. They can do an injustice, such as the gentleman spoke of, of \$100,000 in one real-estate transaction. That is something that cannot be done here.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, more than that damage could be done here by a dishonest Commissioner. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] gave you the crux of it a while ago when he said it was the moral influence of that bond over officials that counted most. You put them under bond and keep them under bond. I hope I will never vote, as long as I am in the House, to relieve a public official from giving bond to require faithful and honest performance of service to the people of the country whom he represents.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What reason is there for not having these bonds covered by a blanket bond instead of individual bonds?

Mr. BLANTON. Not a bit. They could do it and save much on premiums.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And would it not save a lot of money?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. They would save a lot of money by having a blanket bond.

I want to call attention to one other thing and then I will have finished.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I regret I have not the time. I do not want to be interrupted for a moment. I am sorry.

Some of you older Members will remember some 12 years ago I made an investigation, when I was a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of the insurance department of the District of Columbia, when Insurance Commissioner Miller was in charge there. You will remember the report I then filed with Congress, which is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, wherein I showed that that man was accepting bribes from insurance companies all over the land. He was collecting annual bonuses from them in order to allow them to do business in the District of

Columbia. I showed instance after instance where he had collected those bonuses. The very next day after I filed my report the Commissioners fired him and kicked him out of office. Suppose he had not been under bond? Suppose you had relieved him of bond? When you relieve the Commissioners of bond you take all the responsibility off of their shoulders, if there should ever be one who is dishonest.

And once in a while a commissioner is dishonest. I will remind you of former Commissioner Col. Frederic A. Fenning. There are men in this House who some years ago saw me take this floor and on my responsibility as a Member of Congress, impeach a Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Col. Frederic A. Fenning, of high crimes and misdemeanors. I presented evidence against him before the Gibson committee for several weeks. It condemned Fenning. He had three of the leading lawyers of Washington to defend him. Frank Hogan, the great criminal lawyer, was one of his attorneys. After I impeached him from this floor, I prosecuted him before our Judiciary Committee for several weeks, and I piled up the evidence on him so strong, I showed where he had had many scores of shell-shocked soldiers of the World War declared insane and had put them in insane asylums, and he had himself appointed their committee, or guardian, and he had robbed them out of nearly \$200,000. I forced him to resign and I forced him to pay back some of that money to those shell-shocked soldiers.

It pays to have high commissioners under bond. Once in a while you get a black sheep among them. Once in a while you may again get another black sheep among some of the officials of the District of Columbia. There is no reason why they should not give bond. They have done it since 1878. It is no reflection on their honesty. Let us keep them under bond.

When the proper time comes I shall move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill, and if you want to keep them under bond, which they have been under since 1878, you will vote for my motion. Why have they not asked to be relieved in all that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield myself 1 more minute and that is all I want. Why did they not ask to be relieved 10 years ago, or 20 years ago? Why did they not ask to be relieved 30 years ago? Why did they not ask to be relieved 40 years ago? They have waited all these years since 1878, and been under bond since 1878, and this is the first time they have ever prepared a bill and brought it up here asking to be relieved from giving a bond.

I am going to vote to make them give a bond. I am not going to vote to relieve them. You can do it if you want to, but the responsibility will be upon your shoulders. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mrs. NORTON. That concludes the general debate, Mr. Chairman, and the Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 103, ch. 180), entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia", be, and the same hereby is, amended by repealing the provision "and shall, before entering upon the duties of the office, each give bond in the sum of \$50,000, with surety as is required by existing law", and said section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The said Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding, to determine which officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall hereafter be required to give or renew bond for the faithful discharge of their duties and to fix the penalty of any such bond."

With the following committee amendments—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk reads the committee amendments, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. Chairman, I have debated this bill. I am not going to take up any further time. If you vote to strike out the enacting clause, you will leave the law as it has been since

1878, and will not relieve high officials from giving bonds. If you vote down my motion you will pass this bill relieving the Commissioners and 31 high officials from giving bond, and will leave the people they serve without this protection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. Considering the millions of dollars that are handled every year by these Commissioners, their many official acts, contracts, and so forth they pass upon, and the men appointed under them who will be relieved from bond under this bill, it seems to me as though to pass this bill would be nothing short of a tragedy.

Mr. BLANTON. We have turned over to them for the next fiscal year \$41,000,000. They can make contracts involving every penny of it. It is a ridiculous proposition to relieve them of such bonds, for they control every person who will pay out this \$41,000,000 and every person who makes contracts respecting it.

It is nothing to me personally. I have done my duty. I have called the matter to your attention, and when I vote against this bill, that is all I can do.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] a few moments ago propounded a question as to how much saving there would be to the Government if this bill were enacted into law. Under the assumption that each commissioner was bonded for \$10,000, it has been stated the saving would be approximately \$1,500. Since that time I have learned that each person is bonded for \$50,000. So the saving instead of being \$1,500 would be approximately \$6,000. I wanted to make this correction and also to have the members of the committee know that the saving to the Government will be \$6,000 rather than \$1,500 as heretofore stated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has any calculation been made as to what the saving would be on a blanket bond instead of individual bonds?

Mr. BLANTON. They could have a blanket bond covering all of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the committee would find that a very staggering saving could be made by the use of a blanket bond instead of individual bonds.

Mr. BEITER. I understand the saving in premiums would be about 40 percent.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. The bonding companies realize the extent of the liability or the premium would not amount to \$6,000.

Mr. BEITER. That is their minimum charge, as I understand it.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. They can charge what they please.

Mr. BEITER. Bonding companies generally have a minimum charge, and in this instance I am advised the charge is \$5 per thousand.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. No; they do not. I have represented them 25 years.

Mr. BEITER. I do not doubt the gentleman's statement. However, I know the laws governing bonding companies vary in nearly every State in the Union, and in all probability there is a vast difference between the laws governing bonding companies in the District of Columbia and those in the State of Maryland. I am sure the opponents of this bill are as anxious to effect a saving to the Government as are the members of the District Committee and the District Commissioners who have recommended that this proposed legislation be enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 48, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman cannot get an automatic vote in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7765, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on my motion.

The SPEAKER. There is no such question pending before the House.

Mrs. NORTON. I objected to the vote on the ground there was not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. That question has not been raised in the House.

Mr. BLANTON. The Committee rose before the Committee found it had no quorum.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PALMISANO. As I understood, the gentlewoman from New Jersey objected to the vote on the ground there was not a quorum present, and while that was being considered the gentleman from Texas moved that the Committee rise.

My inquiry is, Does the motion of the gentleman from Texas take precedence over the objection of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

The SPEAKER. The proceedings to which the gentleman refers took place, of course, in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman from Texas moved that the Committee rise; and the Committee has risen, and we are now in the House. There is nothing pending before the House so far as this bill is concerned.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7765.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my motion to permit the gentleman from New York to submit a unanimous-consent request.

HOLDING-COMPANY BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a majority report and minority views on the holding-company bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the announcement of the Chair with respect to my objection to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present.

The SPEAKER. The question is not pending before the House.

NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas further withhold his motion to adjourn?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my motion for the time being.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2074, to create a National Park Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my objection to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I would inform the gentleman that by unanimous consent a similar House bill (H. R. 6734) was passed and no Member on the minority of the committee objected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman can take it up in the morning. For the present, Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 44, noes 46.

So the motion was rejected.

BONDS OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 7765, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7765) to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. No.

The SPEAKER. The House has already decided to go into Committee for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7765, and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7765, with Mr. SCRUGHAM in the chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, as soon as the Clerk reports the bill I have a preferential motion to offer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Committee of the Whole having moved to strike out the enacting clause and there having been further business transacted, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 48, noes 49.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum, and pending that I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, what does the Chair understand tellers are demanded on?

Mr. BLANTON. On the vote to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Following that there was a point of no quorum made.

Mr. BLANTON. No. I made a point of no quorum, and pending that demanded tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. All of those in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand it, this teller vote is being taken on the question of the Committee rising and reporting the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Those in favor of striking out the enacting clause would pass through the tellers first?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And those opposing would pass through later?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that is not a parliamentary inquiry. That is telling the Members how to vote.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 45, noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "any statute to the contrary notwithstanding."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "bond", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That this power of the Commissioners shall not apply to officers and employees who receive, disburse, account for, or otherwise are responsible for the handling of money, and whose bonds are now fixed by law. The provisions of the act of Congress entitled 'An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1909, and for other purposes', approved August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 118, 125), relating to rates of premiums for bonds for officers and employees of the United States shall be, and are hereby, made applicable to the rates of premiums for bonds of officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 1578, chapter LV, of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1424), entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", is hereby amended so as to read:

"The surveyor shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation before the Commissioners that he will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of his office, which oath shall be deposited with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. That section 1592 of said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is amended so as to read:

"The assistant surveyor shall take the same oath his principal is required to take, and may, during the continuance of his office, discharge and perform any of the official duties of his principal."

SEC. 4. That said Code of Law for the District of Columbia is further amended by repealing in its entirety section 1597 thereof.

SEC. 5. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7765, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recom-

mendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 52, noes 48.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 115, not voting 143, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—171

Arends	Faddis	McCormack	Reilly
Ayers	Fernandez	McGrath	Robertson
Bacharach	Focht	McKeough	Robinson, Utah
Bland	Gildea	McLaughlin	Robison, Ky.
Boland	Gray, Pa.	McLean	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton	Greenway	McSwain	Rudd
Boylan	Greenwood	Maas	Sadowski
Brennan	Gregory	Maloney	Schneider
Brown, Ga.	Griswold	Marcantonio	Schuetz
Brown, Mich.	Gwynne	Marshall	Schulte
Brunner	Halleck	Martin, Mass.	Scott
Buck	Hancock, N. Y.	Maverick	Secrest
Burch	Harter	May	Shanley
Burnham	Hess	Mead	Sirovich
Carmichael	Higgins, Mass.	Merritt, Conn.	Smith, Va.
Casey	Hill, Ala.	Merritt, N. Y.	Snell
Chapman	Hobbs	Michener	Snyder
Citron	Hoeppel	Monaghan	South
Claborne	Holmes	Montague	Stack
Cole, N. Y.	Imhoff	Nichols	Starnes
Collins	Jacobsen	Norton	Steagall
Costello	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Brien	Stewart
Crosby	Jenkins, Ohio	O'Connell	Sutphin
Cullen	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Connor	Taylor, Colo.
Daly	Jones	O'Day	Terry
Darrow	Kahn	O'Leary	Thomas
Delaney	Kee	O'Neal	Tinkham
Dempsey	Keller	Palmisano	Tolan
Disney	Kelly	Patterson	Tonry
Ditter	Kennedy, Md.	Perkins	Turpin
Dobbins	Kennedy, N. Y.	Pettengill	Vinson, Ga.
Dockweiler	Kenny	Pittenger	Vinson, Ky.
Dorsey	Kerr	Plumley	Walter
Doughton	Kloeb	Powers	Weaver
Drewry	Kvale	Quinn	Welch
Driscoll	Lambeth	Rabaut	Williams
Driver	Lea, Calif.	Ramsay	Wilson, La.
Duffy, N. Y.	Lesinski	Ramspeck	Wolfenden
Duncan	Lewis, Colo.	Randolph	Wolverton
Eckert	Lewis, Md.	Ransley	Wood
Eicher	Lord	Reece	Young
Ekwall	Lundeen	Reed, Ill.	Zioncheck
Ellenbogen	McAndrews	Reed, N. Y.	

NAYS—115

Amlie	Crosser, Ohio	Guyer	McLeod
Ashbrook	Crowe	Hamlin	McReynolds
Biermann	Deen	Harlan	Mapes
Binderup	Dies	Hildebrandt	Massingale
Blackney	Dondero	Hill, Knute	Meeks
Blanton	Duffey, Ohio	Hoffman	Millard
Boileau	Dunn, Miss.	Hook	Mitchell, Ill.
Buckbee	Dunn, Pa.	Hope	Mitchell, Tenn.
Buckler, Minn.	Edmiston	Houston	Mott
Caldwell	Engel	Huddleston	Nelson
Cannon, Mo.	Farley	Hull	Parks
Carlson	Fiesinger	Johnson, Okla.	Parsons
Carpenter	Fletcher	Johnson, Tex.	Patton
Cartwright	Ford, Miss.	Kimball	Pearson
Castellow	Fulmer	Kinzer	Peterson, Fla.
Christianson	Gassaway	Kniffin	Peterson, Ga.
Church	Gearhart	Kocalkowski	Pierce
Colden	Gehrmann	Kramer	Rankin
Colmer	Gilchrist	Lanham	Richards
Cooley	Gillette	Lemke	Richardson
Cooper, Tenn.	Gingery	Lloyd	Rogers, Okla.
Cravens	Goldsborough	Luckey	Romjue
Crawford	Gray, Ind.	Ludlow	Sauthoff
Cross, Tex.	Green	McFarlane	Schaefer

Scrugham
Spence
Stefan
Tarver
Taylor, S. C.

Thomason
Thurston
Truax
Turner
Umstead

Utterback
Warren
Wearin
Whelchel
Whittington

Willcox
Withrow
Wolcott
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—143

Adair	Crowther	Hennings	Russell
Allen	Culkin	Higgins, Conn.	Ryan
Andresen	Cummings	Hill, Samuel B.	Sabath
Andrew, Mass.	Darden	Hollister	Sanders, La.
Andrews, N. Y.	Dear	Kleberg	Sanders, Tex.
Arnold	DeRouen	Knutson	Sandlin
Bacon	Dickstein	Kopplemann	Sears
Bankhead	Dietrich	Lambertson	Seger
Barden	Dingell	Lamneck	Shannon
Beam	Dirksen	Larrabee	Short
Beiter	Doutrich	Lee, Okla.	Sisson
Bell	Doxey	Lehlbach	Smith, Conn.
Berlin	Eagle	Lucas	Smith, Wash.
Bloom	Eaton	McClellan	Smith, W. Va.
Boehne	Englebright	McGehee	Somers, N. Y.
Brewster	Evans	McGroarty	Stubbs
Brooks	Fenerty	McMillan	Sullivan
Buchanan	Ferguson	Mahon	Summers, Tex.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fish	Mansfield	Sweeney
Bulwinkle	Fitzpatrick	Martin, Colo.	Taber
Burdick	Flannagan	Mason	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon, Wis.	Ford, Calif.	Miller	Thom
Carter	Frey	Montet	Thompson
Cary	Fuller	Moran	Tobey
Cavicchia	Gambrill	Moritz	Treadway
Celler	Gasque	Murdock	Underwood
Chandler	Gavagan	Oliver	Wadsworth
Clark, Idaho	Gifford	O'Malley	Wallgren
Clark, N. C.	Goodwin	Owen	Werner
Cochran	Granfield	Patman	West
Coffee	Greever	Peyser	White
Cole, Md.	Haines	Pfeifer	Wigglesworth
Connery	Hancock, N. C.	Polk	Wilson, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Hart	Rayburn	Woodruff
Corning	Hartley	Rich	Woodrum
Cox	Healey	Rogers, N. H.	

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

On the vote:

Mr. Woodrum (for) with Mr. Mahon (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Granfield with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Arnold with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Eagle with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Doxey with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Coffee.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
Mr. Thompson with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Dietrich.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. West with Mr. Greever.
Mr. Thom with Mr. Beiter.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Ford of California.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Owen.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Werner with Mr. Gavagan.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Stubbs.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Sisson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Bell.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. KVALE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter which I have written to the president of the United States group in reference to the Interparliamentary Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

JUNE 18, 1935.

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President United States of America
Group the Interparliamentary Union,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: As a Member of the Congress I wish to protest to you, as president of the United States of America Group of the Interparliamentary Union, against any action or any participation of the United States of America group in relation to international economic or international political questions to be taken up at the next meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

I wish to protest particularly against any action or participation by the American group in relation to the "Harmonization of the Briand-Kellogg Pact with the Covenant of the League of Nations", which topic I note is upon the official agenda for the next meeting.

With regard to my protest, I wish to bring to your attention a statement of Dr. Charles L. Lange, formerly secretary general of the Interparliamentary Union, which appears on page 14 of the Interparliamentary Union, handbook of the American group, 1914. This statement reads:

"But up to the present time the interparliamentarians have always limited themselves to the discussion of questions relating to international law; they have never discussed economic questions, and they have always expressly refused to pronounce themselves on problems of a political nature, in which the interests of different States might be opposed.

"The latter principle is one inevitably bound up with the character of the institution itself. Because the Union is composed of responsible statesmen, belonging to nations whose legitimate interests may from time to time be in conflict, it would inevitably compromise its own authority if it raised its voice for or against this or the other practical solution of international conflicts. The interparliamentary gatherings have, without exception, always restricted themselves to the advocacy of peaceful and judicial methods for the settlement of conflicts."

I desire specifically to bring to your attention that the act authorizing the appropriation for the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union provides as follows: "That an appropriation of \$20,000 annually is hereby authorized, \$10,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made."

It would seem from this language that the United States of America group has authority to participate only in discussions or actions "for the promotion of international arbitration."

Very truly yours,

GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM.

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH—PATRIOT, PIONEER, STATESMAN, LAWYER,
WRITER, COURAGEOUS CHAMPION FOR THE PEOPLE

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, in 80 years of Minnesota history many Congressmen and Senators have come to Washington from the North Star State. The most able and distinguished of them all was Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, of Little Falls, who was destined to reach a place in the hall of fame of this country because of his progressive, forward-looking, common-sense economic views. He was known as a "radical", a term often applied to the great men of the Nation. I predict that Lindbergh will grow in the estimation of the American public, and as he recedes from our day and age his figure will loom larger in our political life.

His books, reproduced by large publishing houses, are now often quoted in the foremost and best-read magazines in the country. It was a strange turn of fate that the stellar accomplishments of his brilliant son should aid in bringing to the attention of the American people the achievements of the father, Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh.

Lindbergh was modest, quiet, and unassuming, a keen student, and his reputation in Washington was that of ability, diligence, and persistence. He was first to arrive at his offices, sometimes coming when the bugles sounded reveille for the troops about Washington. Often at sunrise he would be at work, and whenever I visited his offices I always found him buried in his papers and his writings and his

work. He served five consecutive terms, from March 4, 1907, to March 4, 1917, having served prior to that time as county attorney of Morrison County, Minn., 1891-93.

MINNESOTA PIONEER

He was able to do this tremendous amount of work because of his early training as a woodsman, hunter, and man of work in a frontier country. He was tall, dignified, and slender in appearance. He knew his district thoroughly and was greatly beloved by its people. During his campaigns for Governor of the State of Minnesota he suffered the fires of war time persecution. This persecution now serves to set off his lofty character and makes him outstanding in Minnesota and American history.

We cannot honor Congressman Lindbergh too much. He is not fully appreciated even today, but as the years pass we will know him better for his great accomplishments. The Money Trust investigation, which he sponsored, was the most important investigation of the twentieth century in Congress. Nothing like it before or since has ever been published by any congressional committee, and anything that has happened since, such as the recent Senate investigation, is a mere copy and repetition of the first Pujo Money Trust investigation, for years advocated by Lindbergh. His every prediction concerning the Federal Reserve System has come true.

He was in every sense of the word a real, true, genuine American. He was born in Stockholm, Sweden, January 20, 1859, and was brought by his parents to the homestead near Melrose, Minn., before he reached the age of 1 year. He received an American training in the United States and thoroughly understood our people and our institutions. I have met hundreds of nationally great men in the various Congresses and in my public life; but I have never met a man, no matter what position he held, who made a deeper or more profound impression upon his close personal friends than Charles A. Lindbergh.

LINDBERGH'S POLITICAL BATTLES

Lindbergh always had a plan and a program—a well-thought-out platform. He gave most freely of his time to bring his ideas before the public, often when he must have known how forlorn was the hope of victory. He found, as many others before and since have learned, that the best forum is the public platform in campaign times, primary and election, in campaign years. And always he carried his message to the people in the off years in between elections.

Out there in the hot summer sun on hayracks and wagon platforms he spoke, and he used the early automobile as a forum long before the days of the loudspeaker system. He canoed up and down streams of the north woods and walked over hills and western prairies. He labored hard with his fellow citizens to instruct and convince and urge them to political action.

I remember one winter night, many years ago, when we drove through Shakopee, Minn., and, weary and hungry, Mrs. Lundeen and our little family stopped off at a little country hotel for dinner. A sound of many voices came through the main-room door. Men came and went. Our curiosity was aroused, especially when we learned that the discussion centered around farm problems.

LINDBERGH AND THE FARMERS

Here was "C. A.", as we often called him, in the center of an extremely earnest group of men of the soil, men who that very day struggled hurriedly through their many chores that they might be on hand to confer with their friend—the farmers' friend, the people's friend—Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh. And how late they stayed, and when the group broke up, others lingered on, but "C. A." was there when the last man left, and then he would think and write and ponder and plan. That was Charles A. Lindbergh.

It is well known that the Pujo investigation of 1913, ordered by House Resolutions 429 and 504, before a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, was sponsored by Congressman Lindbergh; his resolutions and speeches resulted in this monumental work. There had been much talk in the country about interlocking directorates, but the Pujo investigation proved their existence. It gave the facts, statistics,

and data. It called Morgan, Carnegie, and Rockefeller, and all the rest of the financial powers in America to Washington, and placed them on the witness stand.

The recent Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigation and other investigations are merely repetitions and only confirm the facts uncovered in the original Money Trust investigation by Lindbergh of Minnesota.

LINDBERGH STATE PARK, LITTLE FALLS, MINNESOTA

In honor of Colonel Lindbergh and his famous father, mother, and home, we of Minnesota have dedicated the Lindbergh State Park at Little Falls, appropriation being made by the State for its maintenance, and the land being deeded to the State by the heirs. There are magnificent pines and a beautiful rural setting above the Mississippi which sweeps on past Little Falls. The location of the park is about 2 miles from the center of Little Falls, Minn., easily accessible from the main highway, running through the Twin Cities, St. Cloud, Little Falls, and Brainerd.

I remember distinctly in 1924, urging the erection of a monument, preferably a great boulder, to be inscribed to the honor and memory of Congressman Lindbergh. I could interest only one man in the matter, Mr. G. A. Raymond, of Minneapolis, a close friend and political supporter of Lindbergh in all his campaigns. Finances were lacking to put the project across. A number of letters were written to granite companies at Little Falls and St. Cloud. We talked of State parks, and I frequently urged upon my Farmer-Labor associates the introduction of a bill into the State legislature to carry out this project.

COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH, WORLD FAMOUS AIR HERO, ONLY SON OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

However, nothing came of it until our world famous Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, only son of Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, conquered the ocean from New York to Paris; even then the matter lagged for some time until Senator Rosenmeier, of Little Falls, introduced a bill which passed the legislature and was signed by our Farmer-Labor Governor, Floyd B. Olson, making possible forever the Lindbergh State Park.

The original Lindbergh home was destroyed by fire many years ago and a new house was built, which still stands. However, this present house was rather badly handled by the crowd which rushed in after the colonel's flight across the ocean. Tens of thousands wrote their names upon every nook and corner; every book and pamphlet and piece of movable furniture disappeared, and even stoves and other articles and utensils were taken apart and carried away, to the great loss of future generations, especially students who would like to examine the volumes, pamphlets, and writings collected by Lindbergh during his long public service. All was carried away and disappeared forever.

AUGUST LINDBERGH OLD FARM HOMESTEAD PROPOSED STATE PARK

For years I have proposed a Melrose-Lindbergh Park near Melrose, Minn., on the original homestead established by Congressman Lindbergh's father, August Lindbergh, in 1860 and where the Congressman grew to manhood. I have conducted much correspondence on this matter. I have urged our State officials and many others to no avail. Some day the original homestead will become a State park in honor of the three Lindberghs—all courageous, undaunted, immortal pioneers.

UNDYING DETERMINATION

A strain of undying determination runs through three generations of the Lindbergh family. Discouragement, persecution, and calamity were met and conquered by grandfather, father, and son. Seldom is such unconquerable spirit found in the successive generations of one family. The whole world knows the odds against which young Colonel Lindbergh staked his life in the first trans-Atlantic flight; his undaunted courage has won for him world-wide admiration. His father, Congressman Lindbergh, displayed the same courageous spirit in facing the bitter persecution of political enemies. In future years his heroism will be more widely known. Both father and son inherited a fighting determination that knew no defeat from the grandfather, August, the Swedish states-

man and American pioneer who emerged from the jaws of death a cripple, and yet lived to build his log house, rear his family, manage his farm, and educate a future Congressman.

COURAGE IN THE FACE OF DEATH

In 1861 a terrible accident befell August Lindbergh. He had hauled a giant log to the mill to be sawed into lumber for his house. At the mill he slipped and fell into a circular saw, losing his left arm to the shoulder and cutting through four ribs. The wagon was hitched to the oxen and August was carried back to his farm—a 4-hour journey—lying prostrate on the wagon floor, his remaining hand gripping his left shoulder to check the flow of blood. It was 3 days and 3 nights before the nearest doctor could be brought to the dying man. His courageous young wife, Louise—30 years his junior—and his son Charles made innumerable trips to the spring during that time, bringing cold water and keeping the bleeding and fever under control. When the doctor arrived amputation was performed without anesthetic, and after 2 years as an invalid, August Lindbergh returned to his work as if nothing had happened, and carried on as before.

FOUNDER OF FARMER-LABOR PARTY

Among all the splendid work of this fine Minnesotan none was more important than his aiding in the building of a Farmer-Labor Party in the State of Minnesota.

He stood by when the going was hard. He was there at its birth. He was the first Farmer-Labor Nonpartisan League candidate for Governor, and was the main support of Dave Evans, who was the first to carry the Farmer-Labor banner for Governor. Throughout the years and to the very end he was a loyal courageous fighter for the principles of right and justice.

I DEFEND ONLY THE RIGHT

Colonel Lindbergh at a recent Washington aircraft hearing said, "I defend only the right." Golden words, taught a Minnesota boy by a wonderful father, who never fought for anything but the right.

We have listed here his many battles—for office, his enemies would say; for principles and country, we reply; for, irrespective of victory or defeat, he drove on with all his power of thought and great physical strength until he fell upon the political battlefield, as he would have chosen, in the midst of a fight where the battle was hottest for Governor, and glory, and his beloved people.

ELECTION HISTORY OF CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

1891-93: County attorney, Morrison County, Minn. (Preceded and followed by Frank W. Lyon, and not a candidate for reelection.)

1906: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota. Primary election, September 1906. The Minneapolis Journal of September 27, 1906, carried the primary election statistics, showing the following totals:

Lindbergh.....	9,917
Buckman.....	8,606

[From the Minneapolis Journal, Thursday evening, Sept. 27, 1906]

LINDBERGH'S LEAD 1,311—COMPLETE RETURNS INCREASE WINNER'S VOTE IN THE SIXTH DISTRICT

C. A. Lindbergh's majority over C. B. Buckman in the Sixth Congressional District was 1,311, or several hundred more than supposed from the early returns. Returns from every county have been received by the State canvassing board. The official result is as follows:

Counties:	Lindbergh	Buckman
Benton.....	398	333
Cass.....	421	740
Crow Wing.....	848	806
Douglas.....	849	804
Hubbard.....	828	482
Meeker.....	921	390
Morrison.....	815	823
Sherburne.....	537	727
Stearns.....	657	430
Todd.....	1,328	1,038
Wadena.....	467	424
Wright.....	1,848	1,609
Totals.....	9,917	8,606

Lindbergh carried 9 of the 12 counties. Buckman carried Cass by 319 and Sherburne by 190. In Morrison County, the home of both candidates, Buckman led by 8 votes, and carried Little Falls.

Lindbergh's majorities ran as follows: Benton, 65; Crow Wing, 42; Douglas, 45; Hubbard, 346; Meeker, 527; Stearns, 227; Todd, 290; Wadena, 43; Wright, 239.

1906: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota.

General election, November 1906:

Lindbergh (Republican)	16,752
Tift (Democrat)	13,115

1908: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota.

Primary election, September 1908:

Lindbergh (Republican)	11,152
Gilkinson (Democrat)	3,893
(Cass County vote missing.)	

General election, November 1908:

Lindbergh (Republican)	22,574
Gilkinson (Democrat)	13,174

1910: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota.

Primary election, September 1910:

Lindbergh (Republican)	13,415
McGarry (Republican)	4,923

General election, November 1910:

Lindbergh (Republican)	25,272
(No opponents listed.)	

1912: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota:

Primary election, September 1912:

Lindbergh (Republican)	12,019
Gilkinson (Democrat)	4,167
Uhl (Public Ownership)	603

General election, November 1912:

Lindbergh (Republican)	21,286
Gilkinson (Democrat)	9,920
Uhl (Public Ownership)	2,839

1914: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, Minnesota:

Primary election, June 1914:

Lindbergh	10,398
Maxfield	6,988

General election, November 1914:

Lindbergh	15,364
Du Bois	11,409
Thomason	3,769
Sharkey	1,836

1916: United States Senator in Congress, Minnesota:

Primary election, June 1916:

Frank B. Kellogg	73,818
Adolph O. Eberhart	54,890
Moses E. Clapp	27,668
Charles A. Lindbergh	26,094

1918: Governor of Minnesota, Republican primary, June 1918:

J. A. A. Burnquist	199,325
Charles A. Lindbergh	150,626

1920: United States Representative in Congress, Sixth District, general election (no Farmer-Labor primary shown):

General election:

Knutson (Republican)	47,954
Lindbergh (Farmer-Labor)	21,587

1923: United States Senator, special election, June 18, 1923: Farmer-Labor primary:

Magnus Johnson	57,570
L. A. Fritsche	38,393
Charles A. Lindbergh	21,811

1924: Governor of Minnesota, Farmer-Labor primary, June 1924. Candidate, but did not live to participate in election. Died May 24, 1924.

These election statistics are taken from the Legislative Manuals of Minnesota.

PERSISTENT MEN OF VISION

It is common to abuse persistent men of vision, like Lindbergh, for their frequent candidacies. The conservative press delights in that, forgetting that their own conservative candidates are inveterate and incurable office seekers.

Suppose we give the record of a great liberal and a great progressive and a great radical—the candidacies of Abraham Lincoln for office, as furnished us by the Congressional Library at Washington, D. C.

Lincoln had a plan and a platform. He always had a well-thought-out program. Why not fight for it, in victory

or defeat? And he did. He surely did. That is the life story of Abraham Lincoln. Here we may read and learn.

ELECTION HISTORY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

1832, March 9: Lincoln announced himself as candidate for the Illinois Legislature.

1832, May 27: Lincoln elected captain of his company in the Black Hawk War.

1832, summer: Lincoln defeated for the legislature. The successful candidates had votes running from 1,127 to 815. Lincoln had 657.

1833: Lincoln appointed postmaster of New Salem. Held office 3 years.

1833: Lincoln appointed deputy county surveyor by John Calhoun, surveyor of Sangamon County. Reappointed by T. N. Neale in 1835.

1834: Lincoln elected to Illinois Legislature by the following vote: Lincoln, 1,376; Dawson, 1,370; Carpenter, 1,170; Stuart, 1,164. Lincoln was reelected in 1836, 1838, and 1840. Received the Whig vote for speaker in 1838 and 1840. Twice defeated for speaker.

1840: Lincoln Presidential elector for William Henry Harrison. Lincoln defeated. Illinois went for Van Buren.

1841: Lincoln declined to be candidate for Governor.

1843: Lincoln sought nomination by Whigs for Congress. Defeated.

1844: Lincoln Presidential elector for Henry Clay. Lincoln defeated. Illinois went for James K. Polk.

1846: Lincoln elected to Congress by the Whigs, majority 1,511.

1848: Lincoln voted against Mexican War. Popular indignation ran high. Refused to stand for renomination.

1849: Lincoln applied for Commissioner of the General Land Office. Failed.

1849: Lincoln offered governorship of Oregon Territory. Declined. Desired to accept, unable to persuade Mrs. Lincoln to go to that far western country.

1850: Lincoln said to have refused a nomination for Congress.

1854: Lincoln elected to the legislature by some 650 majority. Later he resigned because a member could not be candidate for United States Senator.

1855: Lincoln Whig candidate for Senate. Defeated.

1856: Lincoln received 110 votes for Republican candidate for Vice President. Defeated.

1856: Lincoln Presidential elector for Fremont. Defeated. Illinois went for James Buchanan.

1858: Lincoln nominated for the Senate by the Republicans.

1859: Douglas, the Democratic candidate, chosen by the legislature, 54 to 46. Lincoln defeated.

1860: Lincoln nominated and elected President.

1864: Lincoln renominated and reelected President.

CONGRESSMAN LINDBERGH AND THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY

Among the founders of a Labor Party in America we find foremost the name of Lindbergh, who battled it out with his Republican conservative reactionary opponent, J. A. A. Burnquist, in the cruel and vicious war years of 1917-18. The shame of that campaign can never be erased by those who heaped abuse and violence upon a great man. The mere memory of it ought to bring the crimson blush of shame were they not too callous in mind and body. Yes; thank God, they are almost forgotten, but he lives on in glory without end.

What was the result of his work? What accomplishments at Washington? Who were the Farmer-Labor Representatives in House and Senate? We list them here, and may we say, always on the side of liberalism and progress. Had America followed our advice we would have kept out of European entanglements, we would have escaped the destruction of the World War and its inevitable panic and depression. Here is the true American party—loyal to the traditions of the great Republic and building for a better and happier America. Ours is the program for social security, and Lindbergh was our first great teacher. Here is the hope of America—a great national Farmer-Labor Party.

Length of service of Farmer-Labor Senators and Representatives in Congress

Rank	Name	Dates of service	Length of service
SENATORS			
1	Shipstead, Henrik	Mar. 4, 1923	17 years 10 months, when present term expires.
2	Johnson, Magnus	July 16, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925	1 year 7 months 16 days.
REPRESENTATIVES			
1	Kvale, Paul John	Oct. 16, 1929	7 years 2 months 18 days, when present term expires.
2	Kvale, O. J.	Mar. 4, 1923, to Sept. 11, 1929 ("Independent" for 2 years, Mar. 4, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925).	6 years 6 months 7 days.
3	Carss, William L.	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1929 (plus "Independent" for 2 years; Mar. 4, 1919, to Mar. 4, 1921).	6 years.
4	Lundeen, Ernest	Mar. 4, 1933 (plus 2 years as Republican, Mar. 4, 1917, to Mar. 4, 1919)	5 years 10 months, when present term expires.
5	Wefald, Knud	Mar. 4, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1927	4 years.
6	Buckler, R. T.	Jan. 3, 1935	2 years, when present term expires.
7	Arens, Henry	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
	Johnson, Magnus	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
	Shoemaker, F. H.	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.

In order to show the rank of Charles A. Lindbergh among his colleagues, and for general information, we list the Senators and Congressmen of all parties in Minnesota, Territory and State, in order of their rank and service:

Minnesota Congressmen who served in both House and Senate

Rank	Name	Dates of service	Total length of service
1	Nelson, Knute	House, Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1889 (6 years); Senate, Mar. 4, 1895, to Apr. 28, 1923 (28 years 1 month 24 days).	34 years 1 month 24 days.
2	Schall, Thomas D.	House, Mar. 4, 1915, to Mar. 4, 1925 (10 years); Senate, Mar. 4, 1925 (11 years 10 months when present term expires).	21 years 10 months, when present term expires (consecutive service).
3	Windom, William	House, Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1869 (10 years); Senate, July 16, 1870, to Jan. 18, 1871, Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 12, 1881, Oct. 26, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1883 (11 years 10 months 18 days).	21 years 10 months 18 days (not consecutive).
4	Washburn, William D.	House, Mar. 4, 1879, to Mar. 4, 1885 (6 years); Senate, Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1895 (6 years).	12 years.
5	Wilkinson, Morton S.	Senate, Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1865 (6 years); House, Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1871 (2 years).	8 years.
6	Johnson, Magnus	Senate, July 16, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925 (1 year 7 months 16 days); House, Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935 (1 year 10 months).	3 years 5 months 16 days.
7	Towne, Charles A.	House, Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1897 (2 years); Senate, Dec. 5, 1900, to Jan. 23, 1901 (1 month 18 days).	2 years 1 month 18 days.

Length of service of United States Senators from Minnesota

Rank	Name	Dates of service	Length of service
1	Nelson, Knute	Mar. 4, 1895, to Apr. 28, 1923 (died)	28 years 1 month 24 days.
2	Shipstead, Henrik	Mar. 4, 1923	17 years 10 months, when present term expires.
3	Clapp, Moses E.	Jan. 23, 1901, to Mar. 4, 1917	16 years 1 month 9 days.
4	Davis, C. K.	Mar. 4, 1887, to Nov. 27, 1900	13 years 8 months 23 days.
5	McMillan, S. J. R.	Mar. 6, 1875, to Mar. 4, 1887	12 years.
6	Ramsey, Alexander	Mar. 4, 1863, to Mar. 4, 1875	12 years.
7	Schall, Thomas D.	Mar. 4, 1925	11 years 10 months, when present term expires (consecutive service).
8	Windom, William	July 16, 1870, to Jan. 18, 1871; Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 12, 1881; Oct. 26, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1883.	11 years 10 months 16 days (not consecutive).
9	Kellogg, Frank B.	Mar. 4, 1917, to Mar. 4, 1923	6 years.
10	Sabin, D. M.	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1889	6 years.
11	Washburn, William D.	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1895	6 years.
12	Wilkinson, Morton S.	Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1865	6 years.
13	Norton, Daniel S.	Mar. 4, 1865, to July 13, 1870 (died)	5 years 4 months 9 days.
14	Rice, Henry M.	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1863	4 years 9 months 20 days.
15	Johnson, Magnus	July 16, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1925	1 year 7 months 16 days.
16	Shields, James	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1859	9 months 20 days.
17	Edgerton, A. J.	Mar. 14 to Oct. 26, 1881	7 months 12 days.
18	Towne, Charles A.	Dec. 5, 1900, to Jan. 23, 1901	1 month 18 days.
19	Stearns, O. P.	Jan. 18 to Mar. 4, 1871	1 month 14 days.

Length of service of Minnesota Representatives in Congress

Name	Dates of service	Length of service
11 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Davis, Charles R.	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1925	22 years.
10 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Steenerson, Halvor	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1923	20 years.
Volstead, Andrew J.	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1923	20 years.
Knutson, Harold	Mar. 4, 1917	19 years 10 months when present term expires.
9 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Stevens, Frederick C.	Mar. 4, 1897, to Mar. 4, 1915	18 years.
Tawney, James A.	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1911	18 years.
7 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Anderson, Sydney	Mar. 4, 1911, to Mar. 4, 1925	14 years.
McCleary, James T.	Mar. 4, 1899, to Mar. 4, 1907	14 years.
7 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Dunnell, Mark H.	Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 4, 1883	14 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1886, to Mar. 4, 1891	

Length of service of Minnesota Representatives in Congress—Continued

Name	Dates of service	Length of service
6 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Clague, Frank	Mar. 4, 1921, to Mar. 4, 1933	12 years.
Newton, Walter H	Mar. 4, 1919, to June 30, 1929	10 years 3 months 26 days (resigned).
6 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Fletcher, Loren	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1903	12 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1905, to Mar. 4, 1907	
Strait, H. B	Mar. 4, 1873, to Mar. 4, 1879	12 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1881, to Mar. 4, 1887	
5 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Lindbergh, Charles A.	Mar. 4, 1907, to Mar. 4, 1917	10 years.
Miller, Clarence B	Mar. 4, 1909, to Mar. 4, 1919	10 years.
Schall, Thomas D	Mar. 4, 1915, to Mar. 4, 1925	10 years.
Windom, William	Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1869	10 years.
5 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Andresen, August H	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1933	10 years, when present term expires
Do	Jan. 3, 1935	
4 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Eddy, Frank M	Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1903	8 years.
Goodwin, Godfrey G	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1933	8 years.
Hammond, W. S	Mar. 4, 1907, to Mar. 4, 1915	8 years.
Heatwole, Joel P	Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1903	8 years.
Keller, Oscar E	July 10, 1919, to Mar. 4, 1927	7 years 7 months 22 days.
Kvale, Paul John	Oct. 16, 1929	7 years 2 months 18 days, when present term expires.
Kvale, O. J.	Mar. 4, 1923, to Sept. 11, 1929	6 years 6 months 7 days.
4 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Lind, John	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1893	8 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1905	
Maas, Melvin J	Mar. 4, 1927, to Mar. 4, 1933	8 years, when present term expires.
Do	Jan. 3, 1935	
3 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Bede, J. Adam	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1909	6 years.
Donnelly, Ignatius	Mar. 4, 1863, to Mar. 4, 1869	6 years.
Ellsworth, Franklin F	Mar. 4, 1915, to Mar. 4, 1921	6 years.
Morris, Page	Mar. 4, 1897, to Mar. 4, 1903	6 years.
Nelson, Knute	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1889	6 years.
Nye, Frank M	Mar. 4, 1907, to Mar. 4, 1913	6 years.
Selvig, Conrad G	Mar. 4, 1927, to Mar. 4, 1933	6 years.
Washburn, William D	Mar. 4, 1879, to Mar. 4, 1885	6 years.
Van Dyke, Carl C	Mar. 4, 1915, to May 20, 1919	4 years 2 months 16 days.
3 TERMS NOT CONSECUTIVE		
Carss, W. L	Mar. 4, 1919, to Mar. 4, 1921	6 years.
Do	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1929	
Pittenger, William A	Mar. 4, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933	6 years, when present term expires.
Do	Jan. 3, 1935	
Lundeen, Ernest	Mar. 4, 1917, to Mar. 4, 1919	5 years 10 months, when present term expires.
Do	Mar. 4, 1933	
2 TERMS CONSECUTIVE		
Aldrich, Cyrus	Mar. 4, 1859, to Mar. 4, 1863	4 years.
Averill, John T	Mar. 4, 1871, to Mar. 4, 1875	4 years.
Buckman, C. B	Mar. 4, 1903, to Mar. 4, 1907	4 years.
Christgau, Victor	Mar. 4, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933	4 years.
Furlow, Allen J	Mar. 4, 1925, to Mar. 4, 1929	4 years.
Hall, O. M	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1895	4 years.
Kiefer, Andrew R	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1897	4 years.
Larson, Oscar J	Mar. 4, 1921, to Mar. 4, 1925	4 years.
Smith, George R	Mar. 4, 1913, to Mar. 4, 1917	4 years.
Wakefield, J. B	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1887	4 years.
Wefald, Knud	Mar. 4, 1923, to Mar. 4, 1927	4 years.
White, Milo	Mar. 4, 1883, to Mar. 4, 1887	4 years.
Christianson, Theodore	Mar. 4, 1933	3 years 10 months, when present term expires.
Nolan, W. I	July 1, 1929, to Mar. 4, 1933	3 years 8 months 3 days.
1 TERM		
Baldwin, M. R	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1895	2 years.
Boen, Haldor E	Mar. 4, 1893, to Mar. 4, 1895	2 years.
Buckler, R. T	Jan. 3, 1935	2 years, when present term expires.
Castle, J. N	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1893	2 years.
Comstock, S. G	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1891	2 years.
Gillfillan, J. B	Mar. 4, 1885, to Mar. 4, 1887	2 years.
Hall, Darwin S	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1891	2 years.
Halvorson, Kittel	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1893	2 years.
Harries, W. H	Mar. 4, 1891, to Mar. 4, 1893	2 years.
King, William S	Mar. 4, 1875, to Mar. 4, 1877	2 years.
McDonald, John L	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1889	2 years.
Manahan, James	Mar. 4, 1913, to Mar. 4, 1915	2 years.
Poehler, Henry	Mar. 4, 1879, to Mar. 4, 1881	2 years.
Rice, Edmund	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1889	2 years.
Ryan, Elmer J	Jan. 3, 1935	2 years, when present term expires.
Snider, S. P	Mar. 4, 1889, to Mar. 4, 1891	2 years.
Stewart, Jacob H	Mar. 4, 1877, to Mar. 4, 1879	2 years.
Towne, Charles A	Mar. 4, 1895, to Mar. 4, 1897	2 years.
Wilkinson, Morton S	Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1871	2 years.
Wilson, Eugene M	Mar. 4, 1869, to Mar. 4, 1871	2 years.
Wilson, Thomas	Mar. 4, 1887, to Mar. 4, 1889	2 years.
Arens, Henry	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Chase, Ray P	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Hoidale, Einar	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Johnson, Magnus	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Shoemaker, F. H	Mar. 4, 1933, to Jan. 3, 1935	1 year 10 months.
Cavanaugh, J. M	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1859	9 months 20 days.
Phelps, W. W	May 12, 1858, to Mar. 4, 1859	9 months 20 days.

These dates of service are taken from the Minnesota Legislative Manual, 1935, pages 89-90.

MINNESOTA TERRITORIAL DELEGATES TO CONGRESS

Minnesota was made a State in 1858. From 1849 to 1858 there were three Territorial Delegates sent to Congress from Minnesota. These Delegates were:

Henry H. Sibley, January 15, 1849, to March 4, 1853; 4 years 1 month 17 days.

Henry M. Rice, December 5, 1853, to March 4, 1857; 3 years 2 months 27 days.

W. W. Kingsbury, December 7, 1857, to May 11, 1858; 5 months 4 days.

Errors may be discovered by those versed in Minnesota political lore. If so, we will be pleased to stand corrected.

CONGRESSMAN LINDBERGH'S BUST PLACED IN JOHN MORTON MEMORIAL MUSEUM, PHILADELPHIA

I have spoken of Lindbergh's writings, and I here list Lindbergh's books and pamphlets, chronologically furnished me by the John Morton Memorial Museum, of Philadelphia, where recently a bust of Congressman Lindbergh was placed, on Sunday, June 23, 1935, at which ceremony I had the honor to deliver some remarks on the life of Lindbergh. Dr. Amandus Johnson, director of the museum, deserves great credit for his loyal work in remembrance of great Swedish-American immortals honored here—John Morton, John Hanson, John Ericsson, Jenny Lind, and numerous others.

We also wish to call attention to Lindbergh's many speeches delivered between March 4, 1907 and March 4, 1917, during his five consecutive terms—10 years—in Congress. These speeches contain a wealth of information. They are full of prophecies of the future. They are the result of clear thinking and deep study. All of these speeches should be compiled into a set of books containing all of Lindbergh's congressional speeches and writings. This will be done some day.

It was my pleasure to present to the Morton Museum the Rules and Manual of the United States House of Representatives used by Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh. This well-worn volume came into my possession from my friend, G. A. Raymond, now in Portland, Oreg.

LINDBERGH'S BOOKS

1. The Law of Rights. A magazine, I-III. 1905.
2. Banking and Currency and the Money Trust. 1913.
3. Why Is Your Country at War, and What Happens to You After the War, and Related Subjects? 1917. Reprinted, 1934.
4. The Economic Pinch. 1923.
5. Who and What Caused the Panic. (Pamphlet) 1923.

SOCIAL-INSURANCE LEGISLATION

The Lindberghs of Sweden came to America sturdy, independent, thoughtful men. They were always unafraid and smiled through tempests of hatred and opposition. Sweden leads in social legislation. It is a progressive, liberal country. After coming to America, Congressman August Lindbergh, grandfather of the colonel and father of Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, continued his efforts to improve conditions among his fellow men. He was a great Liberal leader in Sweden and, in spite of his language handicap, continued to lead in the American community where he pioneered.

His great son, the American Congressman, followed in the footsteps of his father, who served as congressman in the Swedish Congress; and the world hero of the air, Colonel Lindbergh pioneered and continues to pioneer. Whether in new territories or in new fields of thought, always searching for the truth, each one of these pioneers met the sneers and scoffs of his fellow men calmly. They were men—

In conscious virtue bold
Who dared their secret purpose hold
Unshaken heard the crowds' tumultuous cries
And the impetuous tyrant's angry brow defied.
Let the loud winds, that rule the seas
Tempestuous their wild horrors raise,
Let Jove's dread arm with thunder rend the spheres
Beneath the crash of worlds undaunted they appear.

[Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SEARS for 1 week, on account of important business.

A MILLION RAILROAD MEN FOR WAR REFERENDUM

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by the 21 railroad brotherhoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in one of the most significant and dramatic labor movements of modern times the support of a million men has been placed back of House Joint Resolution No. 167, the constitutional war-referendum resolution, which is designed as a preventive of war. As the author of the resolution I am very grateful for their support.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, which speaks directly for the 1,000,000 organized workingmen who are members of the 21 standard railroad brotherhoods and indirectly reflects the thought of millions of other workingmen, at a meeting in Washington decided to throw its united support back of House Joint Resolution No. 167 as a measure deemed urgently necessary to prevent America from being dragged into war at an early date through the machinations of propagandists of special interests, munition manufacturers, and professional war promoters.

In a communication which scathingly reviews the activities of the war promoters, and which is addressed to the Judiciary subcommittee which has been conducting hearings on the Ludlow resolution, the Railway Labor Executives' Association emphasizes the need of haste, and says:

We urge that every effort be made to speed the final adoption of this resolution. This legislation is racing against the danger of war, and there is no time to spare.

The so-called "Ludlow amendment" provides that, except in the case of invasion or attack, war cannot be declared until the question is submitted to a Nation-wide referendum and a majority of the people of the country vote for war; also that in the event of war all war properties, munitions plants, and so forth, shall be taken over for use of the Government during the period of the emergency, thus removing the profit incentive to war.

In this crisis—for a world situation that reflects such obvious threats of an impending war is truly a crisis—labor of America is fortunate in having to represent it such an influential spokesman as the Railway Labor Executives' Association. This organization of railway employees, sometimes known as the "21 brotherhoods", is the most vital force in the labor movement today. It has initiative, courage, and fighting qualities that make it a tremendous force, not only for the advancement of the labor movement but for good citizenship in America. To it is due a large share of the credit for bringing about a betterment of social and living conditions among all workers, both union and nonunion. It has been unerring in its discernment of intolerable conditions affecting workers and quick and effective in finding the means of correction.

Its plans and purposes are made articulate through the most virile labor publication in the Western Hemisphere, the publication called "Labor", which is issued from the building owned by the Railway Labor Executives' Association at Delaware Avenue and B Streets SW., this city. Edward Keating, who directs that publication, is a forceful editor, a close student of public questions, a former liberal Member of Congress who has the commoner's viewpoint, and whose philosophy is fashioned on the Jeffersonian idea of equality among men.

AN ORGANIZATION THAT IS 100 PERCENT AMERICAN

The American Railway Labor Executives' Association is 100 percent American and it is for protecting the good, solid, honest American manhood from the tricks and schemes of the war promoters who stand convicted at the bar of public opinion of encouraging and promoting strife for the sake of filthy dollars.

The association believes that those who have to pay the awful costs of war and to do the suffering and dying should have something to say as to whether or not war shall be declared, and it is not willing that any American shall be ripped from his family and thrown into the hell of war just to protect somebody's investments, or to enable somebody to pile up fabulous profits. Seventeen years ago the association saw workmen conscripted and thrust into the horrors of the trenches and battlefields of a foreign war at a dollar a day, while 23,000 swivel-chair patriots were being elevated into the class of millionaires at home. While it stands firmly for adequate defense, it does not propose that at any time hereafter, with its consent, the fine young manhood of America shall be sacrificed to fight a foreign war until the question has first been submitted to the people of America and approved by them by a majority vote. That is the sum and substance of the resolution I have introduced.

It goes the entire limit in permitting national defense, but it is opposed to foreign wars unless such wars have the sanction of a majority of Americans in a vote taken in the privacy of the ballot booths where the citizen can record the verdict of his conscience with no one to dictate or swerve him from his honest judgment. To that just and reasonable program the Railway Labor Executives' Association stands pledged with absolute unanimity.

TEXT OF RAILROAD MEN'S APPEAL

The statement adopted by the Railway Labor Executives' Association and presented to the Judiciary Committee by W. D. Johnson, vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, one of the leaders of organized labor, is as follows:

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, representing the 1,000,000 railway workers of the United States, desires to place itself on record with your committee as being unqualifiedly in favor of the immediate passage by Congress, and the ratification by the several States, of the constitutional amendment proposed in House Joint Resolution No. 167.

Every thoughtful American who is at all informed on international affairs must feel that there is very grave danger of another war among European and Asiatic nations within the next few years. Ancient rivalries have been revived and hatreds have been heated again to the point where a minor incident may be enough to precipitate a conflict even more destructive than that of 1914-18. Political adventurers, military leaders, and those industrial interests which profit from wars and preparation for wars have stirred international animosities and brought about a situation which can be compared only to that preceding the Great War. The outbreak of hostilities may occur without warning.

We believe in preparedness, but of a kind directly the opposite of that which our own militarists advocate. We believe that our Government must be prepared to keep America out of the next war; we believe that the people of the United States must be prepared to resist those propagandists who will not hesitate to urge our participation in the holocaust toward which the world is moving. We believe that such preparations, if they are to be effective, must be made now before new warfare has created the atmosphere of panic and hysteria which permits professional patriots to drum up war sentiment. We believe that the constitutional amendment proposed in this resolution is patriotic preparation against European war. We believe that its adoption will keep America out of the general destruction threatening modern civilization.

The workers we represent, in common with all decent citizens of our country, have been sickened and disgusted by the revelations recently made of the activities and the profits of the peddlers of war munitions. Efforts sincerely made by governments desiring to limit armaments, and thereby to lessen the international suspicion which breeds wars, have been defeated by the incredibly brutal and vicious practices of these munition makers. Professional propagandists have collaborated in producing the state of mind among the peoples of the world which assures the widest sale of the implements of war. These munitions makers and their agents are creating their markets and selling their goods with no other thought in mind than securing for themselves the greatest possible profit.

The greed for profits was not lacking from American manufacturers before and during the World War. While American soldiers fought in the trenches to decide a European war whose issues were of no real concern to us, billions of dollars were being paid by our Government directly and through the financial agents of foreign governments to the manufacturers of munitions in the United States. The appalling sacrifices demanded of our soldiers and their families should have brought voluntary surrendering by our munitions manufacturers of all profits; they should have been eager to supply us and our Allies all possible munitions at actual cost. We know now that to the eternal disgrace of these

interests they reaped profits which were far beyond any possible justification, which were possible only because of the desperate need of the Government and the people of the United States.

If European war comes again, there will be no lack of the same kind of destructive and unpatriotic action by our munitions manufacturers. Nothing has happened to make us believe they have changed their spots. There will be no lack of newspapers to give space to false reports of atrocities or to imaginary insults to our national honor. There will be plenty of skilled propagandists who will, for money, use all their arts to confuse and to mislead our people into believing that we should take up arms against some other nation. No sensible American whose memory runs back to the last war and who has followed the disclosures of the munitions investigation, can doubt that the munitions manufacturers will try to force this country into whatever war they can promote in Europe or Asia. No sensible American can fail to realize that war psychology can be created out of the lies and the oratory of the propagandists. No sensible American wants to see us in that next war.

The constitutional amendment that is proposed will prevent the sudden and ill-considered sort of action which might plunge us into war. The referendum will give time for thought and for countering the propaganda of those whose selfish interests would be served by war. More than that, the limitation of munitions profits would not only force upon munitions makers a decent restriction during war—it would also greatly reduce their interest in promoting American belligerency. This amendment, however, still permits speedy congressional action to defend the Nation against actual invasion.

We urge upon your committee that it report out favorably the resolution under consideration and that every effort be made to speed its final adoption. This legislation is racing against the danger of war and there is no time to spare.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of June 24, 1935.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I should very much like to hear what the gentleman has to say, but under the conditions I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow morning after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. SNELL] may have 1 hour to address the House and get in good humor.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2917. An act authorizing an appropriation to the American Legion for its use in effecting a settlement of the remainder due on, and the reorganization of, Pershing Hall, a memorial already erected in Paris, France, to the commander in chief, officers, and men of the expeditionary forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7205. An act to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, otherwise known as "section 30" of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, approved June 5, 1920, to allow the benefits of said act to be enjoyed by owners of certain vessels of the United States of less than 200 gross tons; and

H. R. 7652. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the Federal Reserve Board, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 22, 1935, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7672. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), in compliance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 25, 1935, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

393. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of its activities and expenditures for May 1935, including statements of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case (H. Doc. No. 231); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

394. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 22, 1935, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Mouse River, N. Dak., with a view to the prevention and control of its floods, authorized by act approved February 27, 1931; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 275. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8555; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2796. An act to provide for the control and elimination of public-utility holding companies operating, or marketing securities, in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, to regulate the transmission and sale of electric energy in interstate commerce, to amend the Federal Water Power Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 820. A bill for the relief of James A. Henderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1363. A bill for the relief of Petra M. Benavides; with amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Sarah L. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2115. A bill for the relief of First Lt. R. G. Cuno; with amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2435. A bill for the relief of the Citizens State Bank of Marianna, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2526. A bill for the relief of Powell & Goldstein, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2617. A bill for the relief of the Nacional Destilerias Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Sadie Wilkinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Tom L. Griffith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2702. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Lieberman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3408. A bill for the relief of R. W. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Bernard V. Wolfe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3777. A bill for the relief of the Herald Publishing Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4148. A bill for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4655. A bill for the relief of the Sachs Mercantile Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4770. A bill for the relief of Elinora Fareira; with amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4784. A bill for the relief of J. T. Slayback; with amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5245. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Leiding; with amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5634. A bill for the relief of the Baltimore Renovating Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5867. A bill for the relief of E. C. Willis, father of the late Charles R. Willis, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5905. A bill for the relief of Cal Settles; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6057. A bill for the relief of Joe Brumit; with amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6394. A bill for the relief of William K. Caley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6889. A bill for the relief of A. Zappone and W. R. Fuchs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6892. A bill for the relief of certain Indians on the Cheyenne River Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7393. A bill for the relief of Ralph P. Kellogg; with amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7520. A bill for the relief of David A. Trousdale; with amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7616. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. W. McPeters; with amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7819. A bill for the relief of William C. Price and Joseph C. Lesage; with

amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7962. A bill for the relief of Grier-Lowrance Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8020. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Redhammer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8089. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Baylin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1315.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8618) to repeal section 3345, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the removal of malt liquors from brewery premises without stamps, to enact a new section in lieu thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 8619) authorizing the Secretary of War to purchase lands for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: A bill (H. R. 8620) to provide for the commemoration of the landing of American troops in the island of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 8621) to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8622) to authorize the purchase of the *Winnie Mae* by the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 8623) to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8624) to provide for the disposal of smuggled merchandise, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to require imported articles to be marked in order that smuggled merchandise may be identified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEAL: A bill (H. R. 8625) to exempt publicly owned interstate highway bridges from State, municipal, and local taxation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8626) authorizing a preliminary examination of Middle Fabius River in Scotland and Knox Counties, Mo., with a view to the controlling of floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. STUBBS: A bill (H. R. 8627) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 8628) to provide for the relief of public-school districts and other public-school authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 8629) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Government of Norway in settlement of all claims for reimbursement on account of losses sustained by the owner and crew of the Norwegian steamer *Tampen*; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ECKERT: A bill (H. R. 8630) to amend section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 8631) to provide for the use of net weights in interstate- and foreign-commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 8632) to amend an act entitled "An act to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1933; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 335) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Texas Centennial Exposition and celebrations to be admitted without payment of tariff and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing Congress to recognize the claim of the widow of "Bill" Tilghman; to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 8633) granting a pension to James D. Shelters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 8634) for the relief of Samuel B. Schweitzer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GINGERY: A bill (H. R. 8635) granting an increase of pension to Miriam E. Hogue; to the committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALLECK: A bill (H. R. 8636) granting a pension to Viola Shively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 8637) granting an increase of pension to Harry Kraft; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 8638) for the relief of the Franklin Ice Cream Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8639), granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Bross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE: A bill (H. R. 8640) for the relief of L. S. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8641) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of L. S. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 8642) for the relief of Mrs. John Deisher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONAGHAN: A bill (H. R. 8643) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Daley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 8644) granting the consent of Congress to J. L. Jones, Tyre W. Burton, and H. R. Turley, trustees, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 8645) for the relief of St. Vincent's Catholic Church, of Berkeley Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8646) granting a pension to Ella M. Rickert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8647) granting a pension to Bettie Lee Lomax; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 8648) for the relief of Sadie Mitchell Elmore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEFAN: A bill (H. R. 8649) to provide for the appointment of Ira E. Porter as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 8650) for the relief of Joseph Hovey; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8966. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolutions adopted by the board of managers of the New York Produce Exchange, New York City, urging the enactment of an amendment to section 557 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8967. By Mr. BUCK: Memorial of the California Legislature, memorializing the Federal Relief Administrator to make available funds for the extension of Highway Route No. 163 through the Venice and Santa Monica Bay areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8968. Also, memorial of the California Legislature, memorializing the President of the United States to make ample provisions for the encouragement of the artistic, cultural, humane, patriotic, and sentimental phases of our American national life in the Federal works plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8969. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the textile employees and citizens of the city of Lawrence, Mass., requesting that the processing tax on cotton be abolished, that foreign importations of textiles be limited, and that the President recommend, and Congress adopt, legislation which will preserve and protect the textile industry of New England; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8970. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Senate and Assembly of California Legislature, relative to memorializing the Federal Relief Administrator to make available funds for the extension of Highway Route No. 163 through the Venice and Santa Monica Bay areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8971. By Mr. COLDEN: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 63, adopted by the Assembly and the Senate of the California State Legislature, and submitted by the Honorable Frank F. Merriam, Governor of California, relative to memorializing the President of the United States to make ample provision for the encouragement of the artistic, cultural, humane, patriotic, and sentimental phases of our American national life in the Federal works plan; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8972. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Petition of citizens of Easton, Md., opposing the reenactment of the Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8973. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the New York State Legislature, favoring the repeal of the charter of the North River Bridge Co. in Public Act 350, Sixty-seventh Congress, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8974. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, favoring necessary legislation and cooperation of Public Works Administration for construction of freight tunnel between the States of New York and New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8975. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, urging legislation to make Columbus Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8976. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging legislation for the benefit of the milk and dairy industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8977. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging passage of the Rudd bill (H. R. 6); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

8978. By Mr. KEE: Petition of M. T. Jones and other citizens of McDowell County, W. Va., urging the Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8979. Also, petition of J. D. Scyphers and other citizens of McDowell County, W. Va., urging the Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8980. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Joseph T. Schwartz, Fremont, Ohio, a stockholder of one of Ohio's leading oil-producing, manufacturing, and distributing companies, endorsing the views expressed by the American Petroleum Institute, in a petition to the Congress of the United States, in reference to legislation affecting the industry, as contained in Senate bill 2445 or similar proposals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8981. Also, petition of the United Textile Workers of America, Providence, R. I., by their vice president, Horace A. Riviere, urging support of the Wagner-Connery labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8982. Also, petition of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Columbus, Ohio, by their president, Perry L. Green, urging that large amounts of the funds appropriated from the emergency relief funds for use on public highways be assigned to the development of the secondary or farm-to-market highways; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8983. Also, petition of the Alameda County Club of Adult Blind, Berkeley, Calif., by their president, Henry M. Bindt, urging support of House bill 6628, which provides employment for the blind; to the Committee on Labor.

8984. Also, petition of Frazier-Lemke Moratorium Club of Seneca County, Ohio, by their president, David C. Hilsinger, and secretary, E. G. Brosius, urging immediate passage of the Frazier-Lemke farm refinance bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8985. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Slovak League of America, urging the enactment of House bill 8163; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, May 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 24, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3806. An act to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 7765. An act to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES—LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 82)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, Capitol firemen, for the fiscal year 1936, amounting to \$31,150, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 83)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, requiring an appropriation for their payment, amounting to \$770,661.39, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.